CONTRIBUTIONS TO "THE EXAMINER."

NOTE.

THE new ministry, which came into power on the fall of the able administration of Godolphin in 1710, was the famous Oxford ministry headed by Harley and St. John. The new leaders were well aware that they would have to use all the means in their power not only to justify themselves to the English nation, but successfully to defeat the strong opposition which had such a man as Marlborough for its moving spirit. The address to Queen Anne from the Commons, showing undoubted evidences of St. John's hand, was the first employment of a means by which this ministry hoped to appeal to the public. But this remarkable literary effort had already been preceded by the establishment of a weekly political paper, entitled "The Examiner," a few weeks before Godolphin's fall. During the months of August, September, and October, in which were issued twelve papers, Dr. Freind, Atterbury, Prior and St. John, were the men employed to arouse the nation to a necessary condition of discontent. Now that the ministry was in power, the necessity for continuing these public appeals was felt to be all the stronger; and Harley's shrewdness in selecting Swift to take this important matter in hand shows his ability as a party leader.

The first number of "The Examiner" was issued on August 3rd, 1710, and the paper was continued until July 26th, 1711. On December 6th, 1711, William Oldisworth revived it, and issued it weekly until December 18th, 1712, after which date it was published twice a week until July 26th, 1714, though it occasionally happened that only one was issued in a week. The last number was No. 19 of the sixth volume, so that Oldisworth edited vols. ii., iii., iv., v., and what was published of vol. vi. The death of the Queen put an end to the publication.

Swift was called to his work about the middle of October of 1710, and his first paper appeared in No. 14. From that number to No. 45, Swift continued with unabated zeal and with masterly effect to carry out the policy of his friends. He also wrote a part of No. 46, and Nos. 16 and 21 of the third volume, which appeared on January 16th and February 2nd, 1712-13. These two last numbers are not included in the present volume, since they have been printed in the fifth volume of this edition of Swift's works with the titles "An Appendix to the Conduct of the Allies" and "The Vindication of Erasmus Lewis."

The appearance of "The Examiner" had brought an opposition paper into the field, entitled "The Whig Examiner," a periodical that ably maintained its party's stand in the face of St. John's attacks. But this paper only lasted for five weeks, and when Swift took charge of the Tory organ, the position of "The Examiner" was entirely altered. As Mr. Churton Collins ably remarks: "It became a voice of power in every town and in every hamlet throughout England. It was an appeal made, not to the political cliques of the metro-

polis, but to the whole kingdom; and to the whole kingdom it spoke. . . . No one who will take the trouble to glance at Swift's contributions to 'The Examiner' will be surprised at their effect. They are masterpieces of polemical skill. Every sentence—every word—comes home. Their logic, adapted to the meanest capacity, smites like a hammer. Their statements, often a tissue of mere sophistry and assumption, appear so plausible, that it is difficult even for the cool historian to avoid being carried away by them. At a time when party spirit was running high, and few men stopped to weigh evidence, they must have been irresistible." ("Jonathan Swift," 1893, p. 81.)

In his "Memoirs relating to that Change" (vol. v., p. 384), Swift gives the following explanation of the foundation of this paper. "Upon the rise of this ministry the principal persons in power thought it necessary that some weekly paper should be published, with just reflections upon former proceedings, and defending the present measures of Her Majesty. This was begun about the time of the Lord Godolphin's removal, under the name of 'The Examiner.' . . . The determination was that I should continue it, which I did accordingly for about eight months."

Gay remarks in his pamphlet, "The Present State of Wit, in a Letter to a Friend in the Country," 1711: "'The Examiner' is a paper which all men, who speak without prejudice, allow to be well writ. Though his subject will admit of no great variety, he is continually placing it on so many different lights, and endeavouring to inculcate the same thing by so many beautiful changes of expressions, that men who are concerned in no party, may read him with pleasure. His way of assuming the question in debate is extremely artful; and his 'Letter to Crassus' [No. 28] is, I think, a masterpiece. . . . I presume I need not tell you that 'The Examiner' carries much the more sail as 'tis supposed to be writ by the direction, and under the eye of some great persons who sit at the helm of affairs, and is consequently looked on as a sort of public notice which way they are steering us. The reputed author is Dr. S[wif]t, with the assistance sometimes of Dr. Att[erbur]y and Mr. P[rio]r." With the fall of Bolingbroke on the death of Queen Anne and the accession of George I., "The Examiner" collapsed.

[T. S.]

THE

EXAMINER.

NUMB. 14.[1]

FROM THURSDAY OCTOBER 26 TO THURSDAY NOVEMBER 2. 1710.

—— Longa est injuria, longae
Ambages, sed summa sequar fastigia rerum.[2]

IT is a practice I have generally followed, to converse in equal freedom with the deserving men of both parties; and it was never without some contempt, that I have observed persons wholly out of employment, affect to do otherwise: I doubted whether any man could owe so much to the side he was of, though he were retained by it; but without some great point of interest, either in possession or prospect, I thought it was the mark of a low and narrow spirit.

It is hard, that, for some weeks past, I have been forced in my own defence, to follow a proceeding that I have so much condemned in others. But several of my acquaintance among the declining party, are grown so insufferably peevish and splenetic, profess such violent apprehensions for the

[1] No. 13 in the reprint. The No. 13 (from Thursday, October 19, to Thursday, October 26, 1710) of the original is omitted from the reprint, and the Nos. from 14 to 48 are slipped back one. No. 49 also is omitted, and Nos. 50 to 52 slipped back two. [T. S.]

[2] Virgil, "Aeneid," i. 341-2.

"Her whole tale of wrong
'Twere tedious to relate. But I will give
The leading facts."—R. KENNEDY.

[T. S.]

public, and represent the state of things in such formidable ideas, that I find myself disposed to share in their afflictions, though I know them to be groundless and imaginary, or, which is worse, purely affected. To offer them comfort one by one, would be not only an endless, but a disobliging task. Some of them, I am convinced would be less melancholy, if there were more occasion. I shall therefore, instead of hearkening to further complaints, employ some part of this paper for the future, in letting such men see, that their natural or acquired fears are ill-grounded, and their artificial ones as ill-intended. That all our present inconveniencies,[1] are the consequence of the very counsels they so much admire, which would still have increased, if those had continued: and that neither our constitution in Church or State, could probably have been long preserved, without such methods as have been lately taken.

The late revolutions at court, have given room to some specious objections, which I have heard repeated by well-meaning men, just as they had taken them up on the credit of others, who have worse designs. They wonder the Queen would choose to change her ministry at this juncture,[2] and thereby give uneasiness to a general who has been so long successful abroad; and might think himself injured, if the entire ministry were not of his own nomination. That there were few complaints of any consequence against the late men in power, and none at all in Parliament; which on the contrary, passed votes in favour of the chief minister. That if her Majesty had a mind to introduce the other party, it

[1] "The Observator" of Nov. 8th, commenting on this statement, remarks: "All the inconveniences we labour under at present, are so far from being the consequence of the counsels of the late ministry, that they are visibly the consequence of those of the 'Examiner's' party, who brought the nation to the brink of Popery and slavery, from which they were delivered by the Revolution; and are pursuing the same measures again," etc. [T. S.]

[2] See "Memoirs relating to that Change" (vol. v., pp. 359-90). The Queen's action in dismissing her ministers and dissolving Parliament in September was, even to Swift himself, a matter for wonder: "I never remember," he writes to Stella (Sept. 20th, 1710), "such bold steps taken by a Court." And Tindal, commenting on the change, says: "So sudden and so entire a change in the ministry is scarce to be found in our history, especially where men of great abilities had served with such zeal and success." ("Hist. of England," iv. 192.) [T. S.]

would have been more seasonable after a peace, which now we have made desperate, by spiriting the French, who rejoice at these changes, and by the fall of our credit, which unqualifies us for continuing the war. That the Parliament so untimely dissolved,[1] had been diligent in their supplies, and dutiful in their behaviour. That one consequence of these changes appears already in the fall of the stocks: that we may soon expect more and worse: and lastly, that all this naturally tends to break the settlement of the Crown, and call over the Pretender.

These and the like notions are plentifully scattered abroad, by the malice of a ruined party, to render the Queen and her administration odious, and to inflame the nation. And these are what, upon occasion, I shall endeavour to overthrow, by discovering the falsehood and absurdity of them.

It is a great unhappiness, when in a government constituted like ours, it should be so brought about, that the continuance of a war, must be for the interest of vast numbers (peaceable as well as military) who would otherwise have been as unknown as their original. I think our present condition of affairs, is admirably described by two verses in Lucan,

> *Hinc usura vorax, avidumque in tempore foenus,*
> *Hinc concussa fides, et multis utile bellum,*[2]

which without any great force upon the words, may be thus translated,

"Hence are derived those exorbitant interests and annuities; hence those large discounts for advances and prompt payment; hence public credit is shaken, and hence great numbers find their profit in prolonging the war."

It is odd, that among a free trading people, as we take

[1] Parliament was dissolved by proclamation on September 21st. [T. S.]

[2] "Pharsalia," i. 181-2.

> "Hence debt unthrifty, careless to repay,
> And usury still watching for its day:
> Hence perjuries in every wrangling court;
> And war, the needy bankrupt's last resort."
>
> N. ROWE.

Lucan wrote "*et* concussa." [T. S.]

ourselves to be, there should so many be found to close in with those counsels, who have been ever averse from all overtures towards a peace. But yet there is no great mystery in the matter. Let any man observe the equipages in this town; he shall find the greater number of those who make a figure, to be a species of men quite different from any that were ever known before the Revolution, consisting either of generals and colonels, or of such whose whole fortunes lie in funds and stocks: so that power, which according to the old maxim, was used to follow land, is now gone over to money; and the country gentleman is in the condition of a young heir, out of whose estate a scrivener receives half the rents for interest, and hath a mortgage on the whole, and is therefore always ready to feed his vices and extravagancies while there is any thing left. So that if the war continues some years longer, a landed man will be little better than a farmer at a rack rent, to the army, and to the public funds.

It may perhaps be worth inquiring from what beginnings, and by what steps we have been brought into this desperate condition: and in search of this, we must run up as high as the Revolution.

Most of the nobility and gentry who invited over the Prince of Orange, or attended him in his expedition, were true lovers of their country and its constitution, in Church and State; and were brought to yield to those breaches in the succession of the crown, out of a regard to the necessity of the kingdom, and the safety of the people, which did, and could only, make them lawful; but without intention of drawing such a practice into precedent, or making it a standing measure by which to proceed in all times to come; and therefore we find their counsels ever tended to keep things as much as possible in the old course. But soon after, an under set of men, who had nothing to lose, and had neither borne the burthen nor heat of the day, found means to whisper in the king's ear, that the principles of loyalty in the Church of England, were wholly inconsistent with the Revolution.[1] Hence began the early practice of caressing

[1] Commenting on this passage, "The Observator" of Nov. 8th remarked: "One would take the author to be some very great man, since he speaks so contemptuously of both Houses of Parliament; for they

the dissenters, reviling the universities, as maintainers of arbitrary power, and reproaching the clergy with the doctrines of divine-right, passive obedience and non-resistance.[1] At the same time, in order to fasten wealthy people to the new government, they proposed those pernicious expedients of borrowing money by vast *premiums*, and at exorbitant interest: a practice as old as Eumenes,[2] one of Alexander's captains, who setting up for himself after the death of his master, persuaded his principal officers to lend him great sums, after which they were forced to follow him for their own security.

This introduced a number of new dexterous men into business and credit: It was argued, that the war could not last above two or three campaigns, and that it was easier for the subject to raise a fund for paying interest, than to tax them annually to the full expense of the war. Several persons who had small or encumbered estates, sold them, and turned their money into those funds to great advantage: merchants, as well as other moneyed men, finding trade was dangerous, pursued the same method: But the war continuing, and growing more expensive, taxes were increased, and funds multiplied every year, till they have arrived at the monstrous height we now behold them. And that which was at first a corruption, is at last grown necessary, and what every good subject must now fall in with, though he may be allowed to wish it might soon have an end; because it is with a kingdom, as with a private fortune, where every

actually found those doctrines, as then preached up, to be inconsistent with the Revolution, and declared it loudly to the world without whispering." [T. S.]

[1] Writing to the Earl of Peterborough (Feb. 171$\frac{0}{1}$), Swift refers to "a pamphlet come out, called 'A Letter to Jacob Banks,' showing that the liberty of Sweden was destroyed by the principle of passive obedience." The pamphlet was written by one W. Benson, and bore the title, "A Letter to Sir J—— B——, By Birth a S——, . . . Concerning the late Minehead doctrine," etc., 1711. "This dispute," says Swift to Peterborough, "would soon be ended, if the dunces who write on each side, would plainly tell us what the object of this passive obedience is in our country." (Scott, vol. xv., p. 423.)

See also, on this matter, "Examiner," Nos. 34 and 40 *post*. [T. S.]

[2] Eumenes of Cardia was secretary to Alexander the Great, and distinguished himself both as a statesman and general. He was killed B.C. 316. [T. S.]

new incumbrance adds a double weight. By this means the wealth of the nation, that used to be reckoned by the value of land, is now computed by the rise and fall of stocks: and although the foundation of credit be still the same, and upon a bottom that can never be shaken; and though all interest be duly paid by the public, yet through the contrivance and cunning of stock-jobbers, there has been brought in such a complication of knavery and cozenage, such a mystery of iniquity, and such an unintelligible jargon of terms to involve it in, as were never known in any other age or country of the world. I have heard it affirmed by persons skilled in these calculations, that if the funds appropriated to the payment of interest and annuities, were added to the yearly taxes, and the four-shilling aid [1] strictly exacted in all counties of the kingdom, it would very near, if not fully, supply the occasions of the war, at least such a part, as in the opinion of very able persons, had been at that time prudence not to exceed. For I make it a question, whether any wise prince or state, in the continuance of a war, which was not purely defensive, or immediately at his own door, did ever propose that his expense should perpetually exceed what he was able to impose annually upon his subjects? Neither if the war lasts many years longer, do I see how the next generation will be able to begin another, which in the course of human affairs, and according to the various interests and ambition of princes, may be as necessary for them as it has been for us. And had our fathers left us as deeply involved as we are like to leave our children, I appeal to any man, what sort of figure we should have been able to make these twenty years past. Besides, neither our enemies, nor allies, are upon the same foot with us in this particular. France and Holland, our nearest neighbours, and the farthest engaged, will much sooner recover themselves after a war. The first, by the absolute power of the prince, who being master of the lives and fortunes of his subjects, will quickly find expedients to pay his debts: and so will the other, by their prudent administration, the greatness of their trade, their wonderful parsimony, the willingness of their people to undergo all kind of taxes, and their justice in applotting as well as

[1] The land tax at the time was four shillings in the pound. [T. S.]

collecting them. But above all, we are to consider that France and Holland fight in the continent, either upon, or near their own territories, and the greatest part of the money circulates among themselves; whereas ours crosses the sea either to Flanders, Spain, or Portugal, and every penny of it, whether in specie or returns, is so much lost to the nation for ever.

Upon these considerations alone, it was the most prudent course imaginable in the Queen, to lay hold of the disposition of the people for changing the Parliament and ministry at this juncture, and extricating herself, as soon as possible, out of the pupillage of those who found their accounts only in perpetuating the war. Neither have we the least reason to doubt, but the ensuing Parliament will assist her Majesty with the utmost vigour,[1] till her enemies *again* be brought to sue for peace, and *again* offer such terms as will make it both honourable and lasting; only with this difference, that the Ministry perhaps will not *again* refuse them.[2]

Audiet pugnas vitio parentum
Rara Juventus.[3]

---

[1] In her speech to Parliament on Nov. 27th, 1710, Anne said: "The carrying on the war in all its parts, but particularly in Spain, with the utmost vigour, is the likeliest means, with God's blessing, to procure a safe and honourable peace for us and all our allies, whose support and interest I have truly at heart" ("Journals of House of Lords," xix. 166).

[2] This is a dig at the Duke of Marlborough, for what the Tories thought an unnecessarily harsh insistence on the inclusion of a clause in the preliminaries of the Gertruydenberg Treaty, which it was thought he must have known would be rejected by Louis. They suspected Marlborough did this in order to keep the war going, and so permit himself further opportunities for enriching himself. The treaty for peace, carried on at Gertruydenberg in 1710, was discussed by Marlborough and Townshend acting for England, the Marquis de Torcy acting for France, and Buys and Vanderdussen for the States. Several conferences took place, and preliminary articles were even signed, but the Allies demanded a security for the delivering of Spain. This Louis XIV. refused to do, and the conference broke up in July, 1710. See Swift's "Conduct of the Allies" (vol. v., pp. 55-123). [T. S.]

[3] Horace, "Odes," I. ii. 23, 24.

> "Our youth will hear, astonished at our crimes,
> That Roman armies Romans slew;
> Our youth, alas! will then be few."—A. MAYNWARING.
> [T. S.]

NUMB. 15.[1]

FROM THURSDAY NOVEMBER 2, TO THURSDAY NOVEMBER 9. 1710.

E quibus hi vacuas implent sermonibus aures,
Hi narrata ferunt alio: mensuraque ficti
Crescit, et auditis aliquid novus adjicit autor,
Illic Credulitas, illic temerarius Error,
Vanaque Laetitia est, consternatique Timores,
Seditioque recens, dubioque autore susurri.[2]

I AM prevailed on, through the importunity of friends, to interrupt the scheme I had begun in my last paper, by an Essay upon the Art of Political Lying. We are told, "the Devil is the father of lies, and was a liar from the beginning"; so that beyond contradiction, the invention is old: And which is more, his first essay of it was purely political, employed in undermining the authority of his Prince, and seducing a third part of the subjects from their obedience. For which he was driven down from Heaven, where (as Milton expresseth it) he had been viceroy of a great western province;[3] and forced to exercise his talent in

[1] No. 14 in the reprint. [T.S.]

[2] Ovid, "Metamorphoses," xii. 56-61.

> "The troubled air with empty sounds they beat,
> Intent to hear, and eager to repeat.
> Error sits brooding there, with added train
> Of vain Credulity, and Joys as vain:
> Suspicion, with Sedition joined, are near,
> And Rumours raised, and Murmurs mixed, and panic Fear."
> J. DRYDEN. [T. S.]

[3] "Paradise Lost," v. 708-710. Milton makes Satan say: "We possess the quarters of the North," and places his throne in "the limits of the North." By speaking of a *western* province Swift intends Ireland, then under the government of the Earl of Wharton. This paper may be read in connection with the 23rd number of "The Examiner," and the "Short Character of Wharton" (vol. v., pp. 1-28). [T. S.]

inferior regions among other fallen spirits, or poor deluded men, whom he still daily tempts to his own sin, and will ever do so till he is chained in the bottomless pit.

But though the Devil be the father of lies, he seems, like other great inventors, to have lost much of his reputation, by the continual improvements that have been made upon him.

Who first reduced lying into an art, and adapted it to politics, is not so clear from history, though I have made some diligent enquiries: I shall therefore consider it only according to the modern system, as it has been cultivated these twenty years past in the southern part of our own island.

The poets tell us, that after the giants were overthrown by the gods, the earth in revenge produced her last offspring, which was Fame.[1] And the fable is thus interpreted; that when tumults and seditions are quieted, rumours and false reports are plentifully spread through a nation. So that by this account, *lying* is the last relief of a routed, earth-born, rebellious party in a state. But here, the moderns have made great additions, applying this art to the gaining of power, and preserving it, as well as revenging themselves after they have lost it: as the same instruments are made use of by animals to feed themselves when they are hungry, and bite those that tread upon them.

But the same genealogy cannot always be admitted for *political lying;* I shall therefore desire to refine upon it, by adding some circumstances of its birth and parents. A political lie is sometimes born out of a discarded statesman's head, and thence delivered to be nursed and dandled by the mob. Sometimes it is produced a monster, and *licked* into shape; at other times it comes into the world completely formed, and is spoiled in the licking. It is often born an infant in the regular way, and requires time to mature it: and often it sees the light in its full growth, but dwindles away by degrees. Sometimes it is of noble birth; and sometimes the spawn of a stock-jobber. *Here*, it screams aloud at the opening of the womb; and *there*, it is delivered with a whisper. I know a lie that now disturbs half the kingdom

[1] Fama was said to be a daughter of Terra. See Virgil, "Aeneid," iv. 173-178. [T. S.]

with its noise, which though too proud and great at present to own its parents, I can remember in its whisper-hood. To conclude the nativity of this monster; when it comes into the world without a *sting*, it is still-born; and whenever it loses its sting, it dies.

No wonder, if an infant so miraculous in its birth, should be destined for great adventures: and accordingly we see it has been the guardian spirit of a prevailing party for almost twenty years. It can conquer kingdoms without fighting, and sometimes with the loss of a battle: It gives and resumes employments; can sink a mountain to a mole-hill, and raise a mole-hill to a mountain; has presided for many years at committees of elections; can wash a blackamoor white; make a saint of an atheist, and a patriot of a profligate; can furnish foreign ministers with intelligence, and raise or let fall the credit of the nation. This goddess flies with a huge looking-glass in her hands, to dazzle the crowd, and make them see, according as she turns it, their ruin in their interest, and their interest in their ruin. In this glass you will behold your best friends clad in coats powdered with *flower-de-luces*[1] and triple crowns; their girdles hung round with chains, and beads, and wooden shoes: and your worst enemies adorned with the ensigns of liberty, property, indulgence, and moderation, and a cornucopia in their hands. Her large wings, like those of a flying-fish, are of no use but while they are moist; she therefore dips them in mud, and soaring aloft scatters it in the eyes of the multitude, flying with great swiftness; but at every turn is forced to stoop in dirty way for new supplies.

I have been sometimes thinking, if a man had the art of the second sight for seeing lies, as they have in Scotland for seeing spirits, how admirably he might entertain himself in this town; to observe the different shapes, sizes, and colours, of those swarms of lies which buzz about the heads of some people, like flies about a horse's ears in summer: or those legions hovering every afternoon in Popes-head Alley,[2] enough to darken the air; or over a club of discontented grandees, and thence sent down in cargoes to be scattered at elections.

[1] A reply to the insinuations that the Tories were sympathetic to France, and that the Whigs were the true patriots. [T. S.]

[2] The reprint has "Exchange Alley." [T. S.]

There is one essential point wherein a political liar differs from others of the faculty; that he ought to have but a short memory, which is necessary according to the various occasions he meets with every hour, of differing from himself, and swearing to both sides of a contradiction, as he finds the persons disposed, with whom he has to deal. In describing the virtues and vices of mankind, it is convenient upon every article, to have some eminent person in our eye, from whence we copy our description. I have strictly observed this rule; and my imagination this minute represents before me a certain great man [1] famous for this talent, to the constant practice of which he owes his twenty years' reputation of the most skilful head in England, for the management of nice affairs. The superiority of his genius consists in nothing else but an inexhaustible fund of political lies, which he plentifully distributes every minute he speaks, and by an unparalleled generosity forgets, and consequently contradicts the next half-hour. He never yet considered whether any proposition were true or false, but whether it were convenient for the present minute or company to affirm or deny it; so that if you think to refine upon him, by interpreting every thing he says, as we do dreams by the contrary, you are still to seek, and will find yourself equally deceived, whether you believe him or no: the only remedy is to suppose that you have heard some inarticulate sounds, without any meaning at all. And besides, that will take off the horror you might be apt to conceive at the oaths wherewith he perpetually tags both ends of every proposition: though at the same time I think he cannot with any justice be taxed for perjury, when he invokes God and Christ, because he has often fairly given public notice to the world, that he believes in neither.

Some people may think that such an accomplishment as this, can be of no great use to the owner or his party, after it has been often practised, and is become notorious; but they are widely mistaken: Few lies carry the inventor's mark; and the most prostitute enemy to truth may spread a thousand without being known for the author. Besides, as the vilest writer has his readers, so the greatest liar has his believers; and it often happens, that if a lie be believed only for an

[1] The Earl of Wharton. [T. S.]

hour, it has done its work, and there is no farther occasion for it. Falsehood flies, and Truth comes limping after it; so that when men come to be undeceived, it is too late, the jest is over, and the tale has had its effect: like a man who has thought of a good repartee, when the discourse is changed, or the company parted: or, like a physician who has found out an infallible medicine, after the patient is dead.

Considering that natural disposition in many men to lie, and in multitudes to believe, I have been perplexed what to do with that maxim, so frequent in every body's mouth, that "Truth will at last prevail." Here, has this island of ours, for the greatest part of twenty years, lain under the influence of such counsels and persons, whose principle and interest it was to corrupt our manners, blind our understandings, drain our wealth, and in time destroy our constitution both in Church and State; and we at last were brought to the very brink of ruin; yet by the means of perpetual misrepresentations, have never been able to distinguish between our enemies and friends. We have seen a great part of the nation's money got into the hands of those, who by their birth, education and merit, could pretend no higher than to wear our liveries; while others,[1] who by their credit, quality and fortune, were only able to give reputation and success to the Revolution, were not only laid aside, as dangerous and useless; but loaden with the scandal of Jacobites, men of arbitrary principles, and pensioners to France; while Truth, who is said to lie in a well, seemed now to be buried there under a heap of stones. But I remember, it was a usual complaint among the Whigs, that the bulk of landed men was not in their interests, which some of the wisest looked on as an ill omen; and we saw it was with the utmost difficulty that they could preserve a majority, while the court and ministry were on their side; till they had learned those

[1] Refers to the Tories generally, and in particular to Sir Thomas Osborne, Bart. (1631-1712), who was created Duke of Leeds in 1694. In 1679, as Earl of Danby, he was impeached by the Commons, and imprisoned in the Tower for five years. "He assisted greatly," says Scott, "in the Revolution, yet continued a steady Tory, and avowed at Sacheverell's trial, that, had he known the Prince of Orange designed to assume the crown, he never would have drawn a sword for him." [T. S.]

admirable expedients for deciding elections, and influencing distant boroughs by *powerful motives* from the city. But all this was mere force and constraint, however upheld by most dexterous artifice and management: till the people began to apprehend their properties, their religion, and the monarchy itself in danger; then we saw them greedily laying hold on the first occasion to interpose. But of this mighty change in the dispositions of the people, I shall discourse more at large in some following paper; wherein I shall endeavour to undeceive those deluded or deluding persons, who hope or pretend, it is only a short madness in the vulgar, from which they may soon recover. Whereas I believe it will appear to be very different in its causes, its symptoms, and its consequences; and prove a great example to illustrate the maxim I lately mentioned, that "Truth" (however sometimes late) "will at last prevail."

NUMB. 16.[1]

FROM THURSDAY NOVEMBER 9, TO THURSDAY NOVEMBER 16. 1710.

——— medioque ut limite curras,
Icare, ait, moneo: ne si demissior ibis,
Unda gravet pennas, si celsior, ignis adurat.[2]

IT must be avowed, that for some years past, there have been few things more wanted in England, than such a paper as this ought to be; and such as I will endeavour to make it, as long as it shall be found of any use, without entering into the violences of either party. Considering the many grievous misrepresentations of persons and things, it is highly requisite, at this juncture, that the people throughout the kingdom, should, if possible, be set right in their opinions by some impartial hand, which has never been yet attempted: those who have hitherto undertaken it, being upon every account the least qualified of all human-kind for such a work.

We live here under a limited monarchy, and under the doctrine and discipline of an excellent Church: We are unhappily divided into two parties, both which pretend a mighty zeal for our religion and government, only they disagree about the means.[3] The evils we must fence against are, on one side, fanaticism and infidelity in religion; and

[1] No. 15 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Ovid, "Metamorphoses," viii. 203-5.

"My boy, take care
To wing your course along the middle air:
If low, the surges wet your flagging plumes;
If high, the sun the melting wax consumes."

S. CROXALL.
[T. S.]

[3] See the pamphlets: "The Thoughts of an Honest Tory," 1710 [by Bp. Hoadly]; "Faults on both Sides . . . by way of answer to 'The Thoughts of an Honest Tory,'" 1710 [by a Mr. Clements]; and

anarchy, under the name of a commonwealth, in government: on the other side, popery, slavery, and the Pretender from France. Now to inform and direct us in our sentiments, upon these weighty points; here are on one side two stupid, illiterate scribblers, both of them fanatics by profession; I mean the "Review"[1] and "Observator."[2] On the other side we have an open Nonjuror,[3] whose character and person, as well as good learning and sense, discovered upon other subjects, do indeed deserve respect and esteem; but his "Rehearsal," and the rest of his political papers, are yet more pernicious than those of the former two. If the generality of the people know not how to talk or think, till they have read their lesson in the papers of the week, what

"Faults in the Fault-Finder: or, a Specimen of Errors in . . . 'Faults on Both Sides,'" 1710; etc., etc. [T. S.]

[1] "The Review" was edited by Daniel Defoe. He commenced it on February 19th, 170⅘, as "A Weekly Review of the Affairs of France"; but about this time it had lost much of its early spring and verve. It was discontinued after June 11th, 1713. Gay thought, speaking of "The Review," that Defoe was "a lively instance of those wits, who, as an ingenious author says, will endure but one skimming" ("Present State of Wit"). [T. S.]

[2] "The Observator" was founded by John Tutchin. The first number was issued April 1st, 1702, and it appeared, with some intervals, until July, 1712, though Tutchin himself died in 1707. For his partisanship for Monmouth poor Tutchin came under the anger of Judge Jeffreys, who sentenced him to several floggings. Pope's couplet in the "Dunciad" has immortalized him:

> "Earless on high stood unabashed De Foe,
> And Tutchin flagrant from the scourge below."

[T. S.]

[3] This was the Rev. Charles Leslie, whose periodical, "The Rehearsal," was avowedly Jacobite. The paper appeared from August 5th, 1704, until March 26th, 1709. In 1708-9 all the numbers were republished in four volumes folio, with the title: "A View of the Times, their Principles and Practices: in the First [Second, etc.] Volume of the Rehearsals," and under the pseudonym "Philalethes." Later he engaged in a controversy with Bishop Hoadly. See also note on p. 354, vol. v.

Of Swift's use of the term "Nonjuror," "The Medley" (June 18th, 1711, No. 38) made the following remarks: "If he speaks of him with relation to his party, there can be nothing so inconsistent as a Whig and a Nonjuror: and if he talks of him merely as an author, all the authors in the world are Nonjurors, but the ingenious divine who writ 'The Tale of a Tub' . . . for he is the first man who introduced those figures of rhetoric we call swearing and cursing in print." [T. S.]

a misfortune is it that their duty should be conveyed to them through such vehicles as those? For let some gentlemen think what they please, I cannot but suspect, that the two worthies I first mentioned, have in a degree done mischief among us; the mock authoritative manner of the one, and the insipid mirth of the other, however insupportable to reasonable ears, being of a level with great numbers among the lowest part of mankind. Neither was the author of the "Rehearsal," while he continued that paper, less infectious to many persons of better figure, who perhaps were as well qualified, and much less prejudiced, to judge for themselves.

It was this reason, that moved me to take the matter out of those rough, as well as those dirty hands, to let the remote and uninstructed part of the nation see, that they have been misled on both sides, by mad, ridiculous extremes, at a wide distance on each side from the truth; while the right path is so broad and plain, as to be easily kept, if they were once put into it.

Further, I had lately entered on a resolution to take very little notice of other papers, unless it were such, where the malice and falsehood, had so great a mixture of wit and spirit, as would make them dangerous; which in the present circle of scribbles, from twelvepence to a halfpenny, I could easily foresee would not very frequently occur. But here again, I am forced to dispense with my resolution, though it be only to tell my reader, what measures I am like to take on such occasions for the future. I was told that the paper called "The Observator," was twice filled last week with remarks upon a late "Examiner."[1] These I read with the first opportunity, and to speak in the news-writers' phrase, they gave me occasion for many speculations. I observed with singular pleasure, the nature of those things, which the owners of them, usually call *answers;* and with what dexterity this matchless author had fallen into the whole art and cant of them. To transcribe here and there three or four detached lines of least weight in a discourse, and by a foolish

[1] "The Observator" for November 8th, 1710 (vol. ix., No. 85), was filled with *more* remarks on the fourteenth "Examiner." Presumably the issue for November 4th, which is not accessible, commenced the attack. [T. S.]

comment mistake every syllable of the meaning, is what I have known many of a superior class, to this formidable adversary, entitle an "Answer."[1] This is what he has exactly done in about thrice as many words as my whole discourse; which is so mighty an advantage over me, that I shall by no means engage in so unequal a combat; but as far as I can judge of my own temper, entirely dismiss him for the future; heartily wishing he had a match exactly of his own size to meddle with, who should only have the odds of truth and honesty; which as I take it, would be an effectual way to silence him for ever. Upon this occasion, I cannot forbear a short story of a fanatic farmer who lived in my neighbourhood, and was so great a disputant in religion, that the servants in all the families thereabouts, reported, how he had confuted the bishop and all his clergy. I had then a footman who was fond of reading the Bible, and I borrowed a comment for him, which he studied so close, that in a month or two I thought him a match for the farmer. They disputed at several houses, with a ring of servants and other people always about them, where Ned explained his texts so full and clear, to the capacity of his audience, and showed the insignificancy of his adversary's cant, to the meanest understanding, that he got the whole country of his side, and the farmer was cured of his itch of disputation for ever after.

The worst of it is, that this sort of outrageous party-writers I have above spoke of, are like a couple of make-bates, who inflame small quarrels by a thousand stories, and by keeping friends at a distance hinder them from coming to a good understanding, as they certainly would, if they were suffered to meet and debate between themselves. For let any one examine a reasonable honest man of either side, upon those opinions in religion and government, which both parties daily buffet each other about, he shall hardly find one material point in difference between them. I would be glad to ask a question about two great men[2] of the late

[1] A humorous specimen of this kind of an "Answer" was given by Swift in No. 23 of "The Examiner," *post.* [T. S.]

[2] The Duke of Marlborough and Lord Godolphin, who commenced their political career as Tories, and only became Whigs through the necessity of identifying their own principles with that of the party which supported their power. [S.]

ministry, how they came to be Whigs? and by what figure of speech, half a dozen others, lately put into great employments, can be called Tories? I doubt, whoever would suit the definition to the persons, must make it directly contrary to what we understood it at the time of the Revolution.

In order to remove these misapprehensions among us, I believe it will be necessary upon occasion, to detect the malice and falsehood of some popular maxims, which those idiots scatter from the press twice a week, and draw an hundred absurd consequences from them.

For example, I have heard it often objected as a great piece of insolence in the clergy and others, to say or hint that the Church was in danger, when it was voted otherwise in Parliament some years ago: and the Queen herself in her last speech, did openly condemn all such insinuations.[1] Notwithstanding which, I did then, and do still believe, the Church has, since that vote, been in very imminent danger; and I think I might then have said so, without the least offence to her Majesty, or either of the two Houses. The Queen's words, as near as I can remember, mentioned the Church being in danger from her administration; and whoever says or thinks that, deserves, in my opinion, to be hanged for a traitor. But that the Church and State may be both in danger under the best princes that ever reigned, and without the least guilt of theirs, is such a truth, as a man must be a great stranger to history or common sense, to doubt. The wisest prince on earth may be forced, by the necessity of his affairs, and the present power of an unruly faction, or deceived by the craft of ill designing men: One

[1] On December 6th, 1705, the House of Lords passed the following resolution: "That the Church of England . . . is now, by God's blessing, under the happy reign of her Majesty, in a most safe and flourishing condition; and that whoever goes about to suggest and insinuate, that the Church is in danger under her Majesty's administration, is an enemy to the Queen, the Church, and the Kingdom" ("Jls. of House of Lords," xviii. 43). On December 8th the House of Commons, by a majority of 212 against 162, agreed to this resolution. In her speech at the prorogation of Parliament on April 5th, 1710, the Queen said: "The suppressing immorality . . . is what I have always earnestly recommended; . . . but, this being an evil complained of in all times, it is very injurious to take a pretence from thence, to insinuate that the Church is in any danger from my administration" ("Jls. of House of Lords," xix. 145). [T. S.]

or two ministers, most in his confidence, may *at first* have good intentions, but grow corrupted by time, by avarice, by love, by ambition, and have fairer terms offered them, to gratify their passions or interests, from *one set of men* than another, till they are too far involved for a retreat; and so be forced to take "seven spirits more wicked than themselves." This is a very possible case; and will not "the last state of such men be worse than the first"? that is to say, will not the public, which was safe at first, grow in danger by such proceedings as these? And shall a faithful subject, who foresees and trembles at the consequences, be called *disaffected*, because he delivers his opinion, though the prince declares, as he justly may, that the danger is not owing to his administration? Or, shall the prince himself be blamed, when in such a juncture he puts his affairs into other hands, with the universal applause of his people? As to the vote against those who should affirm the Church was in danger, I think it likewise referred to danger from or under the Queen's administration, (for I neither have it by me, nor can suddenly have recourse to it;) but if it were otherwise, I know not how it can refer to any dangers but what were past, or at that time present; or how it could affect the future, unless the senators were all *inspired*, or at least that majority which voted it. Neither do I see any crime further than ill manners, to differ in opinion from a majority of either or both Houses; and that ill manners, I must confess I have been often guilty of for some years past, though I hope I never shall again.

Another topic of great use to these weekly inflamers, is the young Pretender [1] in France, to whom their whole party

[1] James, Duke of Cornwall (1688-1766), known as the Chevalier de St. George. At one time the belief was current that the wife of James II. did not give birth to a child, and the "young Pretender" was supposed to be a son of one Mary Grey (see note on p. 409 of vol. v. of present edition of Swift's works). See also: "State-Amusements, Serious and Hypocritical . . . Birth of the Pretended Prince of Wales," 1711; "Seasonable Queries relating to the Birth and Birthright of a Certain Person," 1714; and other pamphlets. In the Act for the Succession to the Crown (6 Ann. c. 41), he is styled, "the Pretended Prince of Wales." History afterwards called him the "Old Pretender" to distinguish him from Charles Edward, the "bonnie Prince Charlie," the Young Pretender. [T. S.]

is in a high measure indebted for all their greatness; and whenever it lies in their power, they may perhaps return their acknowledgments, as out of their zeal for frequent revolutions, they were ready to do to his supposed father: which is a piece of secret history, that I hope will one day see the light; and I am sure it shall, if ever I am master of it, without regarding whose ears may tingle.[1] But at present, the word *Pretender* is a term of art in their possession: A secretary of state cannot desire leave to resign, but the Pretender is at bottom: the Queen cannot dissolve a Parliament, but it is a plot to dethrone herself, and bring in the Pretender. Half a score stock-jobbers are playing the knave in Exchange-Alley, and there goes the Pretender with a sponge. One would be apt to think they bawl out the Pretender so often, to take off the terror; or tell so many lies about him, to slacken our caution, that when he is really coming, *by their connivance*, we may not believe them; as the boy served the shepherds about the coming of the wolf. Or perhaps they scare us with the Pretender, because they think he may be like some diseases, that come with a fright. Do they not believe that the Queen's present ministry love her Majesty, at least as well as *some others* loved the Church? And why is it not as great mark of disaffection now to say the Queen is in danger, as it was some months ago to affirm the same of the Church? Suppose it be a false opinion, that the Queen's right is hereditary and indefeasible; yet how is it possible that those who hold and believe that doctrine, can be in the Pretender's interest? His title is weakened by every argument that strengthens hers. It is as plain as the words of an Act of Parliament can make it, that her present Majesty is heir to the survivor of the late King and Queen her sister. Is not that an hereditary right? What need we explain it any further? I have known an Article of Faith expounded in much looser and more general terms, and that by an author whose opinions are very much followed by a certain party.[2] Suppose we go further, and

[1] Swift kept his word. See "An Enquiry into . . . the Queen's Last Ministry," 1715 (Swift's Works, vol. v., p. 458 *sq.*), and his "History of the Four Last Years of the Queen," 1758. [T. S.]

[2] By Bishop Burnet in his "Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles." [T. S.]

examine the word *indefeasible*, with which some writers of late have made themselves so merry: I confess it is hard to conceive, how any law which the supreme power makes, may not by the same power be repealed: so that I shall not determine, whether the Queen's right be indefeasible or no. But this I will maintain, that whoever affirms it so, is not guilty of a crime. For in that settlement of the crown after the Revolution, where her present Majesty is named in remainder,[1] there are (as near as I can remember) these remarkable words, "to which we bind ourselves and our posterity for ever." Lawyers may explain this, or call them words of form, as they please: and reasoners may argue that such an obligation is against the very nature of government; but a plain reader, who takes the words in their natural meaning, may be excused, in thinking a right so confirmed, is *indefeasible;* and if there be an absurdity in such an opinion, he is not to answer for it.

P.S. When this paper was going to the press, the printer brought me two more *Observators*,[2] wholly taken up in my *Examiner* upon lying, which I was at the pains to read; and they are just such an answer, as the two others I have mentioned. This is all I have to say on that matter.

[1] The reference here is to the Bill of Rights (1 William and Mary, Sess. 2, c. 2), where it is said: "And thereunto the said Lords spiritual and temporal and Commons do, in the name of all the people aforesaid, most humbly and faithfully submit themselves, their heirs and posterities, for ever." In the recital in the Act of Settlement (12 and 13 W. III. c. 2) the words "for ever" are omitted. [T. S.]

[2] "The Observator" of November 11th and 15th (vol. ix., Nos. 86 and 87). In No. 86 "The Examiner" is given "a spiritual shove," and, quoting his statement that a political liar "ought to have but a short memory" to meet occasions "of differing from himself, and swearing to both sides of a contradiction," adds, "the 'Examiner' has this essential qualification of a political liar." It is amusing to find in the same issue "The Observator" calling Jezebel a Tory, and Elijah and Naboth, Whigs! [T. S.]

NUMB. 17.[1]

FROM THURSDAY NOVEMBER 16, TO THURSDAY NOVEMBER 23. 1710.

Qui sunt boni cives? Qui belli, qui domi de patriâ bene merentes, nisi qui patriae beneficia meminerunt? [2]

I WILL employ this present paper upon a subject, which of late hath very much affected me, which I have considered with a good deal of application, and made several enquiries about, among those persons who I thought were best able to inform me; and if I deliver my sentiments with some freedom, I hope it will be forgiven, while I accompany it with that tenderness which so nice a point requires.

I said in a former paper (Numb. 14) that one specious objection to the late removals at court, was the fear of giving uneasiness to a general, who has been long successful abroad: and accordingly, the common clamour of tongues and pens for some months past, has run against the baseness, the inconstancy and ingratitude of the whole kingdom to the Duke of M[arlborough], in return of the most eminent services that ever were performed by a subject to his country; not to be equalled in history. And then to be sure some bitter stroke of detraction against Alexander and Cæsar, who never did us the least injury. Besides, the people that read Plutarch come upon us with parallels drawn from the Greeks and Romans, who ungratefully dealt with I know not how many of their most deserving generals: while the profounder politicians, have seen pamphlets, where Tacitus and Machiavel have been quoted to shew the danger

[1] No. 16 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] "Who are the good citizens? Who are they who—whether at war or at home—deserve well of their country, but those who bear in mind the benefits she has already conferred upon them?" [T. S.]

of too resplendent a merit. Should a stranger hear these furious outcries of ingratitude against our general, without knowing the particulars, he would be apt to enquire where was his tomb, or whether he were allowed Christian burial? not doubting but we had put him to some ignominious death. Or, has he been tried for his life, and very narrowly escaped? has he been accused of high crimes and misdemeanours? has the prince seized on his estate, and left him to starve? has he been hooted at as he passed the streets, by an ungrateful mob? have neither honours, offices nor grants, been conferred on him or his family? have not he and they been barbarously stripped of them all? have not he and his forces been ill paid abroad? and does not the prince by a scanty, limited commission, hinder him from pursuing his own methods in the conduct of the war? has he no power at all of disposing commissions as he pleases? is he not severely used by the ministry or Parliament, who yearly call him to a strict account? has the senate ever thanked him for good success, and have they not always publicly censured him for the least miscarriage? Will the accusers of the nation join issue upon any of these particulars, or tell us in what point, our damnable sin of ingratitude lies? Why, it is plain and clear; for while he is commanding abroad, the Queen dissolves her Parliament, and changes her ministry at home: in which universal calamity, no less than two persons[1] allied by marriage to the general, have lost their places. Whence came this wonderful sympathy between the civil and military powers? Will the troops in Flanders refuse to fight, unless they can have their own lord keeper, their own lord president of the council, their own chief Governor of Ireland, and their own Parliament? In a kingdom where the people are free, how came they to be so fond of having their councils under the influence of their army, or those that lead it? who in all well instituted states, had no commerce with the civil power,

[1] The Earl of Sunderland and Lord Godolphin. Sunderland was succeeded by Dartmouth, in June, as Secretary of State, and Godolphin returned his staff of treasurer in August, the office being placed in commission. Sunderland and Godolphin were both related to Marlborough by marriage. The former married Anne, and the son of the latter Henrietta, daughters of the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough. [T. S.]

further than to receive their orders, and obey them without reserve.

When a general is not so popular, either in his army or at home, as one might expect from a long course of success; it may perhaps be ascribed to his wisdom, or perhaps to his complexion. The possession of some one quality, or a defect in some other, will extremely damp the people's favour, as well as the love of the soldiers. Besides, this is not an age to produce favourites of the people, while we live under a Queen who engrosses all our love, and all our veneration; and where, the only way for a great general or minister, to acquire any degree of subordinate affection from the public, must be by all marks of the most entire submission and respect, to her sacred person and commands;[1] otherwise, no pretence of great services, either in the field or the cabinet, will be able to screen them from universal hatred.

But the late ministry was closely joined to the general, by friendship, interest, alliance, inclination and opinion, which cannot be affirmed of the present; and the ingratitude of the nation, lies in the people's joining as one man, to wish, that such a ministry should be changed. Is it not at the same time notorious to the whole kingdom, that nothing but a tender regard to the general, was able to preserve that ministry so long, till neither God nor man could suffer their continuance? Yet in the highest ferment of things, we heard few or no reflections upon this great commander, but all seemed unanimous in wishing he might still be at the head of the confederate forces; only at the same time, in case he were resolved to resign, they chose rather to turn their thoughts somewhere else, than throw up all in despair. And this I cannot but add, in defence of the people, with regard to the person we are speaking of, that in the high station he has been for many years past, his real defects (as nothing human is without them) have in a detracting age been very sparingly mentioned, either in libels or conversation, and all his successes very freely and universally applauded.

There is an active and a passive ingratitude; applying

[1] See "Memoirs relating to that Change" (Swift's Works, vol. v., pp. 367-8). [T. S.]

both to this occasion, we may say, the first is, when a prince or people returns good services with cruelty or ill usage: the other is, when good services are not at all, or very meanly rewarded. We have already spoke of the former; let us therefore in the second place, examine how the services of our general have been rewarded; and whether upon that article, either prince or people have been guilty of ingratitude?

Those are the most valuable rewards, which are given to us from the certain knowledge of the donor, that they *fit our temper best:* I shall therefore say nothing of the title of Duke, or the Garter, which the Queen bestowed [on] the general in the beginning of her reign; but I shall come to more substantial instances, and mention nothing which has not been given in the face of the world.[1] The lands of Woodstock, may, I believe, be reckoned worth 40,000*l.* On the building of Blenheim Castle 200,000*l.* have been already expended, though it be not yet near finished. The grant of 5,000*l. per ann.* on the post-office, is richly worth 100,000*l.* His principality in Germany may be computed at 30,000*l.* Pictures, jewels, and other gifts from foreign princes, 60,000*l.* The grant at the Pall-Mall, the rangership, &c. for want of more certain knowledge, may be called 10,000*l.* His own, and his duchess's employments at five years value, reckoning only the known and avowed salaries, are very low rated at 100,000*l.* Here is a good deal above half a million of money, and I dare say, those who are loudest with the clamour of ingratitude, will readily own, that all this is but a trifle in comparison of what is untold.[2]

[1] The Queen's Message, proposing to grant to the Duke of Marlborough the Manor of Woodstock and Hundred of Wootton, was read January 17th, 170⅘. A Bill carrying this proposal into effect was introduced January 25th, and passed February 3rd. Blenheim House, erected at the Queen's expense, was settled to go with the dukedom by a Bill introduced in the House of Lords, which passed all its stages in the Commons December 20th, 1706. The pension of £5,000 per annum upon the revenue of the Post Office, granted by the Queen for her lifetime in December, 1702—at a time when the Commons expressed their "trouble" that they could not comply—was made perpetual by a Bill introduced January 14th, 170⅘, passed January 18th, Royal Assent given January 28th (see "Journals of House of Commons," xiv. and xv.). [T. S.]

[2] A broadside, printed in 1712, entitled, "The D——e and D——s of

The reason of my stating this account is only to convince the world, that we are not quite so ungrateful either as the Greeks or the Romans. And in order to adjust this matter with all fairness, I shall confine myself to the latter, who were much the more generous of the two. A victorious general of Rome in the height of that empire, having entirely subdued his enemy, was rewarded with the larger triumph; and perhaps a statue in the Forum, a bull for a sacrifice, an embroidered garment to appear in: a crown of laurel, a monumental trophy with inscriptions; sometimes five hundred or a thousand copper coins were struck on occasion of the victory, which doing honour to the general, we will place to his account; and lastly, sometimes, though not very frequently, a triumphal arch. These are all the rewards that I can call to mind, which a victorious general received after his return from the most glorious expedition, conquered some great kingdom, brought the king himself, his family and nobles to adorn the triumph in chains, and made the kingdom either a Roman province, or at best a poor depending state, in humble alliance to that empire. Now of all these rewards, I find but two which were of real profit to the general; the laurel crown, made and sent him at the charge of the public, and the embroidered garment; but I cannot find whether this last were paid for by the senate or the general: however, we will take the more favourable opinion, and in all the rest, admit the whole expense, as if it were ready money in the general's pocket. Now according to these computations on both sides, we will draw up two fair accounts, the one of Roman gratitude, and the other of British ingratitude, and set them together in balance.

M——h's Loss; being an Estimate of their former Yearly Income," reckons the duke's emoluments at £54,825 per annum, and those of the duchess at £7,500. In the second edition the following paragraph is added:

"The following sums have been rec'd since the year 1701:

"Receiv'd on Accompt of Bread and Bread-waggons	£63,319	3	7
Receiv'd 10,000*l.* by Annual Contingencies . .	100,000	0	0
Receiv'd by 2 and ½ *per cent.* from the payment of Troops	460,062	6	7¾
	623,381	10	2¾"

A BILL OF ROMAN GRATITUDE.

	l.	*s.*	*d.*
Imprimis for frankincense and earthen pots to burn it in	4	10	0
A bull for sacrifice	8	0	0
An embroidered garment	50	0	0
A crown of laurel	0	0	2
A statue	100	0	0
A trophy	80	0	0
A thousand copper medals value half pence a piece	2	1	8
A triumphal arch	500	0	0
A triumphal car, valued as a modern coach	100	0	0
Casual charges at the triumph	150	0	0
Sum total	994	11	10

A BILL OF BRITISH INGRATITUDE.

	l.	*s.*	*d.*
Imprimis Woodstock	40,000	0	0
Blenheim	200,000	0	0
Post-office grant	100,000	0	0
Mildenheim	30,000	0	0
Pictures, jewels, &c.	60,000	0	0
Pall-Mall grant, &c.	10,000	0	0
Employments	100,000	0	0
Sum total[1]	540,000	0	0

[1] In the tenth number of "The Medley" (December 4th, 1710) occurs the following: "'The Examiner,' having it in his thoughts to publish the falsest, as well as the most impudent paper that ever was printed, writ a previous discourse about lying, as a necessary introduction to what was to follow. The first paper was the precept, and the second was the example. By the falsest paper that ever was printed, I mean the 'Examiner' Numb. 17, in which he pretends to give an account of what the Duke of Marlborough has got by his services." The writer in the "Medley," admitting even the correctness of the "Examiner's" sum of £540,000, sets off against this the value of the several battles won by the Duke, and "twenty seven towns taken, which being reckoned at 300,000*l.* a town (the price that Dunkirk was sold at before it was fortified) amounts in all, throwing in the battles and the fortifi-

This is an account of the visible profits on both sides; and if the Roman general had any private perquisites, they may be easily discounted, and by more probable computations, and differ yet more upon the balance; if we consider, that all the gold and silver for safeguards and contributions, also all valuable prizes taken in the war were openly exposed in the triumph, and then lodged in the Capitol for the public service.

So that upon the whole, we are not yet quite so bad at *worst*, as the Romans were at *best*. And I doubt, those who raise this hideous cry of ingratitude, may be mightily mistaken in the consequence they propose from such complaints. I remember a saying of Seneca, *Multos ingratos invenimus, plures facimus;* "We find many ungrateful persons in the world, but we *make* more," by setting too high a rate upon our pretensions, and under-valuing the rewards we receive. When unreasonable bills are brought in, they ought to be taxed, or cut off in the middle. Where there have been long accounts between two persons, I have known one of them perpetually making large demands and pressing for payments, who when the accounts were cast up on both sides, was found to be creditor for some hundreds. I am thinking if a proclamation were issued out for every man to send in his *bill of merits*, and the lowest price he set them at, what a pretty sum it would amount to, and how many such islands as this must be sold to pay them. I form my judgment from the practice of those who sometimes happen to pay themselves, and I dare affirm, would not be so unjust to take a farthing more than they think is due to their deserts. I will instance only in one article. A lady of my acquaintance,[1] appropriated twenty-six pounds a year out of

cations, to 8,100,000*l.*" The balance in favour of the Duke, and presumably in justification of the gifts made him, gave a net result of £7,560,000. [T. S.]

[1] The Duchess of Marlborough, who admitted that the comparison was intended for herself, explained the matter thus: "At the Queen's accession to the government, she . . . desired me to take out of the privy-purse 2,000*l.* a year, in order to some purchase for my advantage . . . I constantly declined it; until the time, that, notwithstanding the uncommon regard I had shown to Her Majesty's interest and honour in the execution of my trusts, she was pleased to dismiss me from her service . . . By the advice of my friends, I sent the Queen

her allowance, for certain uses, which her woman received, and was to pay to the lady or her order, as it was called for. But after eight years, it appeared upon the strictest calculation, that the woman had paid but four pound a year, and sunk two-and-twenty for her own pocket. It is but supposing instead of twenty-six pound, twenty-six thousand, and by that you may judge what the pretensions of *modern merit* are, where it happens to be its own paymaster.

one of her own letters, in which she had pressed me to take the 2,000*l.* a year; and I wrote at the same time to ask Her Majesty whether she would allow me to charge in the privy-purse accounts, which I was to send her, that yearly sum from the time of the offer, amounting to 18,000*l.* Her Majesty was pleased to answer, that I might charge it. This therefore I did" ("An Account of the Conduct of . . . Duchess of Marlborough," 1742, pp. 293-5). The Duchess of Somerset and Mrs. Masham superseded the Duchess of Marlborough in January, 171¼. [T. S.]

NUMB. 18.[1]

FROM THURSDAY NOVEMBER 23, TO THURSDAY NOVEMBER 30. 1710.

Quas res luxuries in flagitiis, . . . avaritia in rapinis, superbia in contumeliis efficere potuisset; eas omnes sese hoc uno praetore per triennium pertulisse aiebant.[2]

WHEN I first undertook this paper, I was resolved to concern myself only with things, and not with persons. Whether I have kept or broken this resolution, I cannot recollect; and I will not be at the pains to examine, but leave the matter to those little antagonists, who may want a topic for criticism. Thus much I have discovered, that it is in writing as in building; where, after all our schemes and calculations, we are mightily deceived in our accounts, and often forced to make use of any materials we can find, that the work may be kept a going. Besides, to speak my opinion, the things I have occasion to mention, are so closely linked to persons, that nothing but Time (the father of Oblivion) can separate them. Let me put a parallel case: Suppose I should complain, that last week my coach was within an inch of overturning, in a smooth, even way, and drawn by very gentle horses; to be sure, all my friends would immediately lay the fault upon John,[3] because they knew, he then presided in my coach-box.

[1] No. 17 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Cicero, "In Q. Caec." i. 3: "They said that whatever luxury could accomplish in the way of vice, . . . avarice in the way of plunder, or arrogance in the way of insult, had all been borne by them for the last three years, while this one man was praetor."—C. D. YONGE. [T. S.]

[3] John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, who had been Captain-General since 1702. He was dismissed from all his offices, December 31st, 1711. The Duke of Ormonde was appointed Commander-in-Chief on January 4th. [T. S.]

Again, suppose I should discover some uneasiness to find myself, I knew not how, over head-and-ears in debt, though I was sure my tenants paid their rents very well, and that I never spent half my income; they would certainly advise me to turn off Mr. Oldfox[1] my receiver, and take another. If, as a justice of peace, I should tell a friend that my warrants and mittimuses were never drawn up as I would have them; that I had the misfortune to send an honest man to gaol, and dismiss a knave; he would bid me no longer trust Charles and Harry,[2] my two clerks, whom he knew to be ignorant, wilful, assuming and ill-inclined fellows. If I should add, that my tenants made me very uneasy with their squabbles and broils among themselves; he would counsel me to cashier Will Bigamy,[3] the seneschal of my manor. And lastly, if my neighbour and I happened to have a misunderstanding about the delivery of a message, what could I do less than strip and discard the blundering or malicious rascal that carried it?[4]

It is the same thing in the conduct of public affairs, where they have been managed with rashness or wilfulness, corruption, ignorance or injustice; barely to relate the facts, at least, while they are fresh in memory, will as much reflect upon the persons concerned, as if we had told their names at length.

I have therefore since thought of another expedient, frequently practised with great safety and success by satirical writers: which is, that of looking into history for some character bearing a resemblance to the person we would describe; and with the absolute power of altering, adding

[1] Godolphin, Lord-Treasurer, nicknamed Volpone. [T. S.]

[2] Charles, Earl of Sunderland, and Henry Boyle (1670-1725), were Secretaries of State. Boyle was created Lord Carleton in 1714. [T. S.]

[3] William, Earl Cowper (1665-1723), was Lord Chancellor under Godolphin's administration (1707-1710), and also in 1714-1718. The "Biographia Britannica" (second edition, vol. iv., p. 389 *n.*) refers to a story that Cowper went through an informal marriage in the early part of his life with a Mrs. Elizabeth Culling, of Hungerfordbury Park. Cowper's first wife was Judith, daughter of Sir Robert Booth, of London; and after her death he married Mary Clavering. See also "Examiner," No. 23, *post*. [T. S.]

[4] Horatio Walpole, secretary to the English Embassy at the treaty of Gertruydenberg. See Swift's accusation against him in "The Conduct of the Allies" (vol. v of present edition). [T. S.]

or suppressing what circumstances we please, I conceived we must have very bad luck, or very little skill to fail. However, some days ago in a coffee-house, looking into one of the politic weekly papers; I found the writer had fallen into this scheme, and I happened to light on that part, where he was describing a person, who from small beginnings grew (as I remember) to be constable of France, and had a very haughty, imperious wife.[1] I took the author as a friend to our faction, (for so with great propriety of speech they call the Queen and ministry, almost the whole clergy, and nine parts in ten of the kingdom)[2] and I said to a gentleman near me, that although I knew well enough what persons the author meant, yet there were several particulars in the husband's character, which I could not reconcile, for that of the lady was just and adequate enough; but it seems I mistook the whole matter, and applied all I had read to a couple of persons, who were not at that time in the writer's thoughts.

Now to avoid such a misfortune as this, I have been for some time consulting Livy and Tacitus, to find out a character of a *Princeps Senatus*, a *Praetor Urbanus*, a *Quaestor Aerarius*, a *Caesari ab Epistolis*, and a *Proconsul*;[3] but among the worst of them, I cannot discover one from whom to draw a parallel, without doing injury to a Roman memory: so that I am compelled to have recourse to Tully. But this author relating facts only as an orator, I thought it

[1] "The Medley" (Nos. 6 and 7, November 6th and 13th, 1710) contains a "Story of the Marquiss D'Ancre and his Wife Galigai," from the French of M. Le Vassor. The Marquis is there described as "the greatest cheat in the whole world"; and "Galigai had the insolence to say a thousand offensive things." The article was intended as a reflection on Harley and Mrs. Masham; but Swift takes it as for the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough. Certainly the character of Galigai may with greater justice be applied to the Duchess. (See "Histoire du regne de Louis XIII. par M. Michel Le Vassor.") Concino Concini, Maréchal D'Ancre, was born at Florence, and died in 1617. [T. S.]

[2] "The Medley" was constantly deriding this alleged proportion. [T. S.]

[3] "The Observator" for December 6th remarks: "If the 'Examiner' don't find better parallels for his *Princeps Senatus*, *Praetor Urbanus*, *Quaestor Aerarius*, and *Caesari ab Epistolis*, than he has done for his Proconsul, Roger, the gentlemen he aims at may sleep without disturbance." [T. S.]

would be best to observe his method, and make an extract from six harangues of his against Verres, only still preserving the form of an oration. I remember a younger brother of mine, who deceased about two months ago, presented the world with a speech of Alcibiades against an Athenian brewer:[1] Now, I am told for certain, that in those days there was no ale in Athens; and therefore that speech, or at least a great part of it, must needs be spurious. The difference between me and my brother is this; he makes Alcibiades say a great deal more than he really did, and I make Cicero say a great deal less.[2] This Verres had been the Roman governor of Sicily for three years; and on return from his government, the Sicilians entreated Cicero to impeach him in the Senate, which he accordingly did in several orations, from whence I have faithfully translated and abstracted that which follows.

"My Lords,[3]

"A pernicious opinion hath for some time prevailed, not only at Rome, but among our neighbouring nations, that a man who has money enough, though he be ever so guilty, cannot be condemned in this place. But however industriously this opinion be spread, to cast an odium on the Senate, we have brought before your lordships Caius Verres, a person, for his life and actions, already condemned by all men; but as he hopes, and gives out, by the influence of his wealth, to be here absolved. In condemning this man,

[1] "The Whig Examiner" (No. 3, September 28th, 1710) prints a speech alleged to have been made by Alcibiades in a contest with an Athenian brewer named Taureas. The allusion was to the Westminster election, when General Stanhope was opposed by a brewer named Thomas Cross. "The Whig Examiner" was written by Addison. Five numbers only were issued (September 14th to October 12th, 1710). "The light and comic style of Addison's parody," notes Scott, may be compared "with the fierce, stern, and vindictive tone of Swift's philippic against the Earl of Wharton, under the name of Verres." [T. S.]

[2] "The Medley" (No. 11, December 11th, 1710) remarks of this adaptation from Cicero, that the writer "has added more rude reflections of his own than are to be found in that author, whose only fault is his falling too much into such reflections." [T. S.]

[3] See also Swift's "Short Character," etc. (vol. v., pp. 1-28 of present edition), and note *in loco*. [T. S.]

you have an opportunity of belying that general scandal, of redeeming the credit lost by former judgments, and recovering the love of the Roman people, as well as of our neighbours. I have brought a man here before you, my lords, who is a robber of the public treasure, an overturner of law and justice, and the disgrace, as well as destruction, of the Sicilian province: of whom, if you shall determine with equity and due severity, your authority will remain entire, and upon such an establishment as it ought to be: but if his great riches will be able to force their way through that religious reverence and truth, which become so awful an assembly, I shall, however, obtain thus much, that the defect will be laid where it ought, and that it shall not be objected that the criminal was not produced, or that there wanted an orator to accuse him. This man, my lords, has publicly said, that those ought to be afraid of accusations who have only robbed enough for their own support and maintenance; but that *he* has plundered sufficient to bribe numbers, and that nothing is so high or so holy which money cannot corrupt. Take that support from him, and he can have no other left. For what eloquence will be able to defend a man, whose life has been tainted with so many scandalous vices, and who has been so long condemned by the universal opinion of the world? To pass over the foul stains and ignominy of his youth, his corrupt management in all employments he has borne, his treachery and irreligion, his injustice and oppression, he has left of late such monuments of his villainies in Sicily, made such havoc and confusion there, during his government, that the province cannot by any means be restored to its former state, and hardly recover itself at all under many years, and by a long succession of good governors. While this man governed in that island, the Sicilians had neither the benefit of our laws, nor their own, nor even of common right. In Sicily, no man now possesses more than what the governor's lust and avarice have overlooked, or what he was forced to neglect out of mere weariness and satiety of oppression. Every thing where he presided, was determined by his arbitrary will, and the best subjects he treated as enemies. To recount his abominable debaucheries, would offend any modest ear, since so many could not preserve their daughters

and wives from his lust. I believe there is no man who ever heard his name, that cannot relate his enormities. We bring before you in judgment, my lords, a public robber, an adulterer, a DEFILER OF ALTARS,[1] an enemy of religion, and of all that is sacred; he sold all employments in Sicily of judicature, magistracy, and trust, places in the council, and the priesthood itself, to the highest bidder; and has plundered that island of forty millions of sesterces. And here I cannot but observe to your lordships, in what manner Verres passed the day: the morning was spent in taking bribes, and selling employments, the rest of it in drunkenness and lust. His discourse at table was scandalously unbecoming the dignity of his station; noise, brutality, and obsceneness. One particular I cannot omit, that in the high character of governor of Sicily, upon a solemn day, a day set apart for public prayer for the safety of the commonwealth; he stole at evening, in a chair, to a married woman of infamous character,[2] against all decency and prudence, as well as against all laws both human and divine. Didst thou think, O Verres, the government of Sicily was given thee with so large a commission, only by the power of that to break all the bars of law, modesty, and duty, to suppose all men's fortunes thine, and leave no house free from thy rapine, or lust? &c."

This extract, to deal ingenuously, has cost me more pains than I think it is worth, having only served to convince me, that modern corruptions are not to be paralleled by ancient examples, without having recourse to poetry or fable. For instance, I never read in story of a law enacted to take away the force of all laws whatsoever;[3] by which a man may safely

[1] Hawkesworth notes: "The story of the Lord Wharton is true; who, with some other wretches, went into a pulpit, and defiled it in the most filthy manner." See also "Examiner," No. 23, *post*. [T. S.]

[2] Probably Mrs. Coningsby. See Swift's "Short Character" (vol. v., p. 27). [T. S.]

[3] The "Act for the Queen's most gracious, general, and free pardon" was passed in 1708 (7 Ann., c. 22). The Earl of Wharton himself profited by this Act. A Mr. George Hutchinson gave Wharton £1,000 to procure his appointment to the office of Register of the Seizures. This was proved before the House of Commons in May, 1713, and the House resolved that it was "a scandalous corruption," and that as it took place "before the Act of Her Majesty's most gracious, general,

commit upon the last of June, what he would infallibly be hanged for if he committed on the first of July; by which the greatest criminals may escape, provided they continue long enough in power to antiquate their crimes, and by stifling them a while, can deceive the legislature into an amnesty, of which the enactors do not at that time foresee the consequence. A cautious merchant will be apt to suspect, when he finds a man who has the repute of a cunning dealer, and with whom he has old accounts, urging for a general release. When I reflect on this proceeding, I am not surprised, that those who contrived a parliamentary sponge for their crimes, are now afraid of a new revolution sponge for their money: and if it were possible to contrive a sponge that could only affect those who had need of the other, perhaps it would not be ill employed.

and free pardon; this House will proceed no further in that matter." ("Journals of House of Commons," vol. xvii., p. 356.) [T. S.]

NUMB. 19.[1]

FROM THURSDAY NOVEMBER 30, TO THURSDAY DECEMBER 7. 1710.

Quippe ubi fas versum atque nefas: tot bella per orbem:
Tam multae scelerum facies ——[2]

I AM often violently tempted to let the world freely know who the author of this paper is; to tell them my name and titles at length; which would prevent abundance of inconsistent criticisms I daily hear upon it. Those who are enemies to the notions and opinions I would advance, are sometimes apt to quarrel with the "Examiner" as defective in point of wit, and sometimes of truth. At other times they are so generous and candid, to allow, it is written by a club, and that very great hands have fingers in it. As for those who only appear its adversaries in print, they give me but very little pain: The paper I hold lies at my mercy, and I can govern it as I please; therefore, when I begin to find the wit too bright, the learning too deep, and the satire too keen for me to deal with, (a very frequent case no doubt, where a man is constantly attacked by such shrewd adversaries) I peaceably fold it up, or fling it aside, and read no more. It would be happy for me to have the same power over people's tongues, and not be forced to hear my own work railed at and commended fifty times a day, affecting all the while a countenance wholly unconcerned, and joining out of policy or good manners with the judgment of both

[1] No. 18 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Virgil, "Georgics," i. 505-6:

"For right and wrong we see perverted here:
So many wars arise, such countless forms
Of crime and evil agitate the globe."—R. KENNEDY. [T. S.]

parties: this, I confess, is too great a hardship for so bashful and unexperienced a writer.[1]

But, alas, I lie under another discouragement of much more weight: I was very unfortunate in the choice of my party when I set up to be a writer; where is the merit, or what opportunity to discover our wit, our courage, or our learning, in drawing our pens for the defence of a cause, which the Queen and both Houses of Parliament, and nine parts in ten of the kingdom, have so unanimously embraced? I am cruelly afraid, we politic authors must begin to lessen our expenses, and lie for the future at the mercy of our printers. All hopes now are gone of writing ourselves into places or pensions. A certain starveling author who worked under the late administration, told me with a heavy heart, above a month ago, that he and some others of his brethren had secretly offered their service dog-cheap to the present ministry, but were all refused, and are now maintained by contribution, like Jacobites or fanatics. I have been of late employed out of perfect commiseration, in doing them good offices: for, whereas some were of opinion that these hungry zealots should not be suffered any longer in their malapert way to snarl at the present course of public proceedings; and whereas, others proposed, that they should be limited to a certain number, and permitted to write for their masters, in the same manner as counsel are assigned for *other* criminals; that is, to say all they can in defence of their client, but not reflect upon the court: I humbly gave my advice, that they should be suffered to write on, as they used to do; which I did purely out of regard to their persons: for I hoped it would keep them out of harm's way, and prevent them from falling into evil courses, which though of little consequence to the public, would certainly be fatal to themselves. If I have room at the bottom of this paper, I will transcribe a petition to the present ministry, sent me by one of these authors, in behalf of himself and fourscore others of his brethren.

For my own part, notwithstanding the little encouragement to be hoped for at this time from the men in power, I

[1] This remark seems to have tickled the writer of the twelfth number of "The Medley," who professed to be transported at the idea of the "Examiner" being a bashful writer. [T. S.]

shall continue my paper till either the world or myself grow weary of it: the latter is easily determined; and for the former, I shall not leave it to the partiality of either party, but to the infallible judgment of my printer. One principal end I designed by it, was to undeceive those well-meaning people, who have been drawn unaware into a wrong sense of things, either by the common prejudices of education and company, the great personal qualities of some party leaders, or the foul misrepresentations that were constantly made of all who durst differ from them in the smallest article. I have known such men struck with the thoughts of some late changes, which, as they pretend to think, were made without any reason visible to the world. In answer to this, it is not sufficient to allege, what nobody doubts, that a prince may choose his own servants without giving a reason to his subjects; because it is certain, that a wise and good prince will not change his ministers without very important reasons; and a good subject ought to suppose, that in such a case there are such reasons, though he be not apprised of them, otherwise he must inwardly tax his prince of capriciousness, inconstancy, or ill-design. Such reasons indeed, may not be obvious to persons prejudiced, or at great distance, or short thinkers; and therefore, if they be no secrets of state, nor any ill consequences to be apprehended from their publication; it is no uncommendable work in any private hand to lay them open for the satisfaction of all men. And if what I have already said, or shall hereafter say of this kind, be thought to reflect upon persons, though none have been named, I know not how it can possibly be avoided. The Queen in her speech mentions, "with great concern," that "the navy and other offices are burthened with heavy debts, and desires that the like may be prevented for the time to come."[1] And, if it be *now* possible to prevent the continuance of an evil that has been so long growing upon us,

[1] In her speech at the opening of Parliament on November 27th, 1710, the Queen said: "I cannot without great concern mention to you, that the Navy and other offices are burthened with heavy debts, which so far affect the public service, that I most earnestly desire you to find some way to answer those demands, and to prevent the like for the time to come." ("Journals of House of Lords," vol. xix., p. 166.) [T. S.]

and is arrived to such a height, surely those corruptions and mismanagements must have been great which first introduced them, before our taxes were eaten up by annuities.

If I were able to rip up, and discover in all their colours, only about eight or nine thousand of the most scandalous abuses,[1] that have been committed in all parts of public management for twenty years past, by a certain set of men and their instruments, I should reckon it some service to my country, and to posterity. But to say the truth, I should be glad the authors' names were conveyed to future times along with their actions. For though the present age may understand well enough the little hints we give, the parallels we draw, and the characters we describe, yet this will all be lost to the next. However, if these papers, reduced into a more durable form, should happen to live till our grandchildren are men, I hope they may have curiosity enough to consult annals, and compare dates, in order to find out what names were then intrusted with the conduct of affairs, in the consequences whereof, themselves will so deeply share; like a heavy debt in a private family, which often lies an incumbrance upon an estate for three generations.

But leaving the care of informing posterity to better pens, I shall with due regard to truth, discretion, and the safety of my person from the men of the new-fangled moderation, continue to take all proper opportunities of letting the misled part of the people see how grossly they have been abused, and in what particulars: I shall also endeavour to convince them, that the present course we are in, is the most probable means, with the blessing of God, to extricate ourselves out of all our difficulties.

Among those who are pleased to write or talk against this paper, I have observed a strange manner of reasoning, which I should be glad to hear them explain themselves

[1] "The Medley" (No. 13, December 25th, 1710) remarks: "When he . . . promises to discover 'only about eight or nine thousand of their most scandalous abuses,' without pretending to discover one; and when he audaciously reviles a general, whose services have been the wonder both of friends and enemies . . . all this he calls 'defending the cause of the Q—— and both Houses of Parliament, and nine parts in ten of the kingdom.'" [T. S.]

upon. They make no ceremony of exclaiming upon all occasions against a change of ministry, in so critical and dangerous a conjuncture. What shall we, who heartily approve and join in those proceedings, say in defence of them? We own the juncture of affairs to be as they describe: we are pushed for an answer, and are forced at last freely to confess, that the corruptions and abuses in every branch of the administration, were so numerous and intolerable, that all things must have ended in ruin, without some speedy reformation. This I have already asserted in a former paper; and the replies I have read or heard, have been in plain terms to affirm the direct contrary; and not only to defend and celebrate the late persons and proceedings, but to threaten me with law and vengeance, for casting reflections on so many great and honourable men, whose birth, virtue and abilities, whose morals and religion, whose love of their country and its constitution in Church and State, were so universally allowed; and all this set off with odious comparisons reflecting on the present choice. Is not this in plain and direct terms to tell all the world that the Qu[een] has in a most dangerous crisis turned out a whole set of the best ministers that ever served a prince, without any manner of reason but her royal pleasure, and brought in others of a character directly contrary? And how so vile an opinion as this can consist with the least pretence to loyalty or good manners, let the world determine.

I confess myself so little a refiner in the politics, as not to be able to discover, what other motive besides obedience to the Queen, a sense of public danger, and a true love of their country, joined with invincible courage, could spirit those great men, who have now under her Majesty's authority undertaken the direction of affairs. What can they expect but the utmost efforts of malice from a set of enraged domestic adversaries, perpetually watching over their conduct, crossing all their designs, and using every art to foment divisions among them, in order to join with the weakest upon any rupture? The difficulties they must encounter are nine times more and greater than ever; and the prospects of interest, after the reapings and gleanings of so many years, nine times less. Every misfortune at home or abroad, though the necessary consequence of former counsels, will

be imputed to them; and all the good success given to the merit of former schemes. A sharper has held your cards all the evening, played booty, and lost your money, and when things are almost desperate, you employ an honest gentleman to retrieve your losses.

I would ask whether the Queen's speech does not contain her intentions, in every particular relating to the public, that a good subject, a Briton and a Protestant can possibly have at heart? "To carry on the war in all its parts, particularly in Spain,[1] with the utmost vigour, in order to procure a safe and honourable peace for us and our allies; to find some ways of paying the debts on the navy; to support and encourage the Church of England; to preserve the British constitution according to the Union; to maintain the indulgence by law allowed to scrupulous consciences; and to employ none but such as are for the Protestant succession in the house of Hanover."[2] It is known enough, that speeches on these occasions, are ever digested by the advice of those who are in the chief confidence, and consequently that these are the sentiments of her Majesty's ministers, as well as her own; and we see, the two Houses have unanimously agreed with her in every article. When the least counterpaces[3] are made to any of these resolutions, it will then be time enough for our malcontents to bawl out Popery, persecution, arbitrary power, and the Pretender. In the mean while, it is a little hard to think, that this island can hold but six men of honesty and ability enough to serve their prince and country; or that our safety should depend upon their credit, any more than it would upon the breath in their nostrils. Why should not a revolution in the ministry be sometimes necessary as well as a revolution in the crown? It is to be presumed, the former is at least as lawful in itself, and perhaps the experiment not quite so dangerous. The revolution of the sun about the earth was formerly thought a necessary expedient

[1] It was a general complaint, that the war in Spain had been neglected, in order to supply that army which was more immediately under the management of Marlborough. [S.]

[2] The quotation is not given verbatim, but is substantially correct. See "Journals of House of Lords," vol. xix., p. 166. [T. S.]

[3] The word is defined by Dr. Murray as "a movement in a contrary or reverse direction; a movement or step against something." [T. S.]

to solve appearances, though it left many difficulties unanswered; till philosophers contrived a better, which is that of the earth's revolution about the sun. This is found upon experience to save much time and labour, to correct many irregular motions, and is better suited to the respect due from a planet to a fixed star.

NUMB. 20.[1]

FROM THURSDAY DECEMBER 7, TO THURSDAY DECEMBER 14. 1710.

Sunt quibus in Satira videor nimis acer, et ultra
Legem tendere opus: sine nervis altera, quicquid
Composui, pars esse putat ——[2]

WHEN the printer came last week for his copy, he brought along with him a bundle of those papers,[3] which in the phrase of Whig coffee-houses have "swinged off" the "Examiner," most of which I had never seen nor heard of before. I remember some time ago in one of the "Tatlers" to have read a letter,[4] wherein several reasons are assigned for the present corruption and degeneracy of our taste, but I think the writer has omitted the principal one, which I take to be the prejudice of parties. Neither can I excuse either side of this infirmity; I have heard the arrantest drivellers *pro* and *con* commended for their smartness even by men of tolerable judgment; and the best performances

[1] No. 19 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Horace, "Satires," II. i. 1-3:

> "There are, to whom too poignant I appear;
> Beyond the laws of satire too severe.
> My lines are weak, unsinewed, others say."—P. FRANCIS. [T. S.]

[3] One of these papers was "The Observator." The issue for December 6th (vol. ix., No. 93) dealt largely with "The Examiner's" attack on Verres (No. 18, *ante*), and the following number returned to the charge, criticizing the attacks made in Nos. 17 and 18 of "The Examiner" on the Duke of Marlborough. [T. S.]

[4] This appears to refer to "The Tatler," No. 183 (June 10th, 1710), where Steele writes: "The ridicule among us runs strong against laudable actions. Nay, in the ordinary course of things, and the common regards of life, negligence of the public is an epidemic vice. . . It were to be wished, that love of their country were the first principle of action in men of business." [T. S.]

exploded as nonsense and stupidity. This indeed may partly be imputed to policy and prudence; but it is chiefly owing to that blindness, which prejudice and passion cast over the understanding: I mention this because I think it properly within my province in quality of *Examiner*. And having granted more than is usual for an enemy to do, I must now take leave to say, that so weak a cause, and so ruined a faction, were never provided with pens more resembling their condition, or less suited to their occasions.

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
Tempus eget ——— [1]

This is the more to be wondered at, when we consider they have the full liberty of the press, that they have no other way left to recover themselves, and that they want not men of excellent parts to set their arguments in the best light they will bear. Now if two men would argue on both sides with fairness, good sense, and good manners, it would be no ill entertainment to the town, and perhaps be the most effectual means to reconcile us. But I am apt to think that men of a great genius are hardly brought to prostitute their pens in a very odious cause; which besides, is more properly undertaken by noise and impudence, by gross railing and scurrility, by calumny and lying, and by little trifling cavils and carpings in the wrong place, which those whifflers use for arguments and answers.

I was well enough pleased with a story of one of these answerers, who in a paper [2] last week found many faults with

[1] Virgil, "Aeneid," ii. 521-2:

"'Tis not such aid or such defence as thine
The time demands."—R. KENNEDY.

[T. S.]

[2] The paper in all probability was "The Medley," No. 10 (December 4th), which was mainly devoted to a reply to Swift's "calculation" as to the rewards of the Duke of Marlborough. Scott thinks the answerer may have been Defoe, for in No. 114 (of vol. vii.) of his "Review of the State of the British Nation," he has a passage evidently directed at Swift: "I know another, that is an orator in the Latin, a walking index of books, has all the libraries in Europe in his head, from the Vatican at Rome, to the learned collection of Dr. Salmon at Fleet-Ditch; but at the same time, he is a cynic in behaviour, a fury in temper, unpolite in conversation, abusive and scurrilous in language, and ungovernable in passion. Is this to be learned? Then may I be still *illiterate*.

a late calculation of mine. Being it seems more deep learned than his fellows, he was resolved to begin his answer with a Latin verse, as well as other folks: His business was to look out for something against an "Examiner" that would pretend to *tax* accounts; and turning over Virgil, he had the luck to find these words,

——— *fugiant examina taxos;*[1]

so down they went, and out they would have come, if one of his unlucky prompters had not hindered it.

I here declare once for all, that if these people will not be quiet, I shall take the bread out of their mouths, and answer the "Examiner" myself;[2] which I protest I have never yet done, though I have been often charged with it; neither have those answers been written or published with my privity, as malicious people are pleased to give out; nor do I believe the common Whiggish report, that the authors are hired by the ministry to give my paper a value.

But the friends of this paper have given me more uneasiness with their impatience, than its enemies by their answers. I heard myself censured last week by some of the former, for promising to discover the corruptions in the late administration, but never performing any thing. The latter on the other side, are thundering out their anathemas against me for discovering so many. I am at a loss how to decide between these contraries, and shall therefore proceed after my own way, as I have hitherto done: my design being of more importance than that of writing only to gratify the

I have been in my time, pretty well master of five languages, and have not lost them yet, though I write no bill over my door, or set *Latin quotations* in the front of the 'Review.' But, to my irreparable loss, I was bred but by halves; for my father, forgetting Juno's royal academy, left the language of Billingsgate quite out of my education: hence I am perfectly *illiterate* in the polite style of the street, and am not fit to converse with the porters and carmen of quality, who grace their diction with the beauties of calling names, and curse their neighbour with a *bonne grace.*" [T. S.]

[1] "Eclogues," ix. 30:

"So may thy bees the poisonous yew forgo."

ARCHDN. F. WRANGHAM.

[T. S.]

[2] See No. 23, *post.* [T. S.]

spleen of one side, or provoke that of the other, though it may occasionally have both effects.

I shall therefore go on to relate some facts that in my humble opinion were no hindrance to the change of the ministry.

The first I shall mention, was that of introducing certain new phrases into the court style, which had been very seldom or never made use of in former times. They usually ran in the following terms: "Madam, I cannot serve you while such a one is in employment: I desire humbly to resign my commission, if Mr. —— continues secretary of state: I cannot answer that the city will lend money, unless my L—d —— be pr[esiden]t of the c[ounc]il. I must beg leave to surrender, except —— has the staff. I must not accept the seals, unless —— comes into the other office." This has been the language of late years from subjects to their prince.[1] Thus they stood upon terms, and must have their own conditions to ruin the nation. Nay, this dutiful manner of capitulating, had spread so far, that every understrapper began at length to perk up and assume: he "expected a regiment"; or "his son must be a major"; or "his brother a collector", else he threatened to vote "according to his conscience."

Another of their glorious attempts, was the clause intended in the bill for the encouragement of learning;[2] for taking off the obligation upon fellows of colleges in both Universities to enter upon holy orders: the design of which, as I have heard the undertakers often confess, was to remove the care of educating youth out of the hands of the clergy, who are apt to infuse into their pupils too great a regard for the Church and the Monarchy. But there was a farther secret in this clause, which may best be discovered by the first projectors, or at least the garblers of it; and these are known

[1] See Swift's account of the intrigues of the Duke of Marlborough and Lord Godolphin to secure Harley's dismissal in his "Memoirs Relating to that Change" (vol. v., pp. 370-371 of present edition), and "Some Considerations" (vol. v., pp. 421-422, *ibid.*).

[2] The "Bill for the Encouragement of Learning" was introduced in the House of Commons, January 11th, $17\frac{09}{10}$, passed March 14th, and obtained royal assent April 5th, 1710. There were several amendments, but the "Journals of the House of Commons" throw no light on their purport. [T. S.]

to be C[o]ll[i]ns[1] and Tindal,[2] in conjunction with a most pious lawyer their disciple.[3]

What shall we say to their prodigious skill in arithmetic, discovered so constantly in their decision of elections; where they were able to make out by the *rule of false*, that three were more than three-and-twenty, and fifteen than fifty? Nay it was a maxim which I never heard any of them dispute, that in determining elections, they were not to consider where the right lay, but which of the candidates was likelier to be true to "the cause." This they used to illustrate by a very apt and decent similitude, of gaming with a sharper; if you cannot cheat as well as he, you are certainly undone.

Another cast of their politics was that of endeavouring to impeach an innocent l[a]dy, for no reason imaginable, but her faithful and diligent service to the Q[ueen],[4] and the favour her M[ajesty] bore to her upon that account, when others had acted contrary in so shameful a manner. What else was the crime? Had she treated her royal mistress with insolence or neglect? Had she enriched herself by a long practice of bribery, and obtaining exorbitant grants? Had she engrossed her M[ajest]y's favours, without admitting any access but through her means? Had she heaped employments upon herself, her family and dependants? Had she an imperious, haughty behaviour? Or, after all, was it a

[1] Anthony Collins (1676-1729), the deist, who wrote "A Discourse of Free-Thinking" (1713), which received a reply from Swift (see vol. iii., pp. 163-192 of present edition). The most thorough reply, however, was made by Bentley, under the pen-name "Phileleutherus Lipsiensis." Collins's controversies with Dr. Samuel Clarke were the outcome of the former's thinking on Locke's teaching. [T. S.]

[2] Matthew Tindal (1657?-1733) was the author of "The Rights of the Christian Church Asserted" (1706), a work that created a great stir at the time, and occasioned many replies. Swift deals with him in his "Remarks upon a Book, intituled, 'The Rights of the Christian Church'" (see vol. iii., pp. 79-124, also note on p. 9 of same volume of present edition). [T. S.]

[3] The pious lawyer was John Asgill (1659-1738), who was called to the bar in 1692. He was elected to Parliament for Bramber (1698-1700 and 1702-1707), but was expelled the House of Commons for blasphemy (see note on p. 9 of vol. iii. of present edition). [T. S.]

[4] Mrs. Masham, when Abigail Hill, was appointed bedchamberwoman to the Princess of Denmark. See vol. v., p. 365 of present edition. [T. S.]

perfect blunder and mistake of one person for another? I have heard of a man who lay all night on a rough pavement; and in the morning, wondering what it could possibly be, that made him rest so ill, happened to see a feather under him, and imputed the uneasiness of his lodging to that. I remember likewise the story of a giant in Rabelais,[1] who used to feed upon wind-mills, but was unfortunately choked with a small lump of fresh butter, before a warm oven.

And here I cannot but observe how very refined some people are in their generosity and gratitude. There is a certain great person[2] (I shall not say of what sex) who for many years past, was the constant mark and butt, against which our present malcontents used to discharge their resentment: upon whom they bestowed all the terms of scurrility, that malice, envy and indignation could invent; whom they publicly accused of every vice that can possess a human heart: pride, covetousness, ingratitude, oppression, treachery, dissimulation, violence and fury, all in the highest extremes: but of late, they have changed their language on a sudden; that person is now the most faithful and just that ever served a prince; that person, originally differing from them in principles, as far as east and west, but united in practice, and falling together, they are now reconciled, and find twenty resemblances between each other, which they could never discover before. *Tanti est ut placeam tibi perire.*[3]

But to return: How could it be longer suffered in a free nation, that all avenues to preferment should be shut up, except a very few, when one or two stood constant sentry, who docked all favours they handed down; or spread a huge invisible net, between the prince and subject, through which nothing of value could pass? And here I cannot but admire

[1] The giant Widenostrils had swallowed every pan, kettle, "dripping-pan, and brass and iron pot in the land, for want of windmills, which were his daily food." But he "choked himself with eating a huge lump of fresh butter at the mouth of a hot oven, by the advice of physicians."—RABELAIS, iv. 17; Motteux's translation. [T. S.]

[2] Daniel Finch, second Earl of Nottingham (1647-1730), was Secretary of State (1689-1693 and 1702-1704). He is the Don Diego Dismallo of "The Tatler" (No. 21). See also vol. v., p. 247, of present edition of Swift's works. [T. S.]

[3] "It is worth while to perish that I may give you pleasure." [T. S.]

at one consequence from this management, which is of an extraordinary nature: Generally speaking, princes who have ill ministers are apt to suffer in their reputation, as well as in the love of the people: but it was not so with the Q[ueen]. When the sun is overcast by those clouds he exhales from the earth, we still acknowledge his light and influence, and at last find he can dispel and drive them down to the horizon. The wisest prince, by the necessity of affairs, the misrepresentations of designing men, or the innocent mistakes, even of a good predecessor, may find himself encompassed by a crew of courtiers, whom time, opportunity and success, have miserably corrupted. And if he can save himself and his people from ruin, under the *worst* administration, what may not his subjects hope for, when with their universal applause, he changes hands, and makes use of the *best?*

Another great objection with me against the late party, was the cruel tyranny they put upon conscience, by a barbarous inquisition, refusing to admit the least toleration or indulgence. They imposed a hundred tests, but could never be prevailed with to dispense with, or take off the smallest, nor even admit of *occasional* conformity;[1] but went on daily (as their apostle Tindal expresseth it) narrowing their terms of communion; pronouncing nine parts in ten of the kingdom heretics, and shutting them out of the pale of their Church. These very men, who talk so much of a comprehension in religion among us, how came they to allow so little of it in politics, which is *their sole religion?* You shall hear them pretending to bewail the animosities kept up between the Church of England and Dissenters, where the differences in opinion are so few and inconsiderable; yet these very sons of moderation were pleased to excommunicate every man who disagreed with them in the smallest article of their *political creed*, or who refused to receive any new article, how difficult soever to digest, which the leaders imposed at pleasure to serve their own interest.

I will quit this subject for the present, when I have told one story.[2] "There was a great king in Scythia, whose

[1] The Occasional Conformity Bill was rejected in 1702, and again in 1703 and 1704. It was, however, passed in 1711; but repealed in 1718. [T. S.]

[2] "The Medley," No. 14 (January 1st, 1710 [*sic*]), translates this

dominions were bounded to the north, by the poor, mountainous territories of a petty lord, who paid homage as the king's vassal. The Scythian prime minister being largely bribed, indirectly obtained his master's consent to suffer this lord to build forts, and provide himself with arms, under pretence of preventing the inroads of the Tartars. This little depending sovereign, finding he was now in a condition to be troublesome, began to insist upon terms, and threatened upon every occasion to unite with the Tartars: upon which, the prime minister, who began to be in pain about his head, proposed a match betwixt his master, and the only daughter of this tributary lord, which he had the good luck to bring to pass: and from that time, valued himself as author of a most glorious union, which indeed was grown of absolute necessity by his corruption." This passage, cited literally from an old history of Sarmatia, I thought fit to set down, on purpose to perplex little smattering remarkers, and put them upon the hunt for an application.

story into an account of the Union. It is the same story, in effect, which gave great offence to the Scotch peers when printed in "The Public Spirit of the Whigs.' The "Medley's" version runs: "England being bounded on the north by a poor mountainous people called Scots, who were vassals to that crown, and the English prime minister, being largely bribed, obtained the Q——'s consent for the Scots to arm and exercise themselves; and they finding they were now in a condition to be troublesome, began to insist upon terms, and threatened upon every occasion to join with the French. Upon which the prime minister, who began to be in pain about his head, set on foot a treaty to unite the two kingdoms, which he had the good luck to bring to pass, and from that time valued himself as author of a most glorious union, which indeed was grown of absolute necessity by his corruption." [T. S.]

NUMB. 21.[1]

FROM THURSDAY DECEMBER 14, TO THURSDAY DECEMBER 21. 1710.

—— *Pugnacem scirent sapiente minorem.*[2]

I AM very much at a loss how to proceed upon the subject intended in this paper, which a new incident has led me to engage in: The subject I mean, is that of soldiers and the army; but being a matter wholly out of my trade, I shall handle it in as cautious a manner as I am able.

It is certain, that the art of war hath suffered great changes, almost in every age and country of the world; however, there are some maxims relating to it, that will be eternal truths, and which every reasonable man will allow.

In the early times of Greece and Rome, the armies of those states were composed of their citizens, who took no pay, because the quarrel was their own; and therefore the war was usually decided in one campaign; or, if it lasted longer, however in winter the soldiers returned to their several callings, and were not distinguished from the rest of the people. The Gothic governments in Europe, though they were of military institution, yet observed almost the same method. I shall instance only here in England. Those who held lands *in capite* of the king, were obliged to attend him in his wars with a certain number of men, who all held lands from them at easy rents on that condition. These fought without pay, and when the service was over, returned again to their farms. It is recorded of William Rufus, that being absent in Normandy, and engaged in a war

[1] No. 20 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Ovid, "Metamorphoses," xiii. 353:

"Well assured, that art
And conduct were of war the better part."
J. DRYDEN. [T. S.]

with his brother, he ordered twenty thousand men to be raised, and sent over from hence to supply his army;[1] but having struck up a peace before they were embarked, he gave them leave to disband, on condition they would pay him ten shillings a man, which amounted to a mighty sum in those days.

Consider a kingdom as a great family, whereof the prince is the father, and it will appear plainly that mercenary troops are only servants armed, either to awe the children at home; or else to defend from invaders, the family who are otherwise employed, and choose to contribute out of their stock for paying their defenders, rather than leave their affairs to be neglected in their absence. The art of making soldiery a trade, and keeping armies in pay, seems in Europe to have had two originals. The first was usurpation, when popular men destroyed the liberties of their country, and seized the power into their own hands, which they were forced to maintain by hiring guards to bridle the people. Such were anciently the tyrants in most of the small states in Greece, and such were those in several parts of Italy, about three or four centuries ago, as Machiavel informs us. The other original of mercenary armies, seems to have risen from larger kingdoms or commonwealths, which had subdued provinces at a distance, and were forced to maintain troops upon them, to prevent insurrections from the natives: Of this sort were Macedon, Carthage and Rome of old; Venice and Holland at this day; as well as most kingdoms of Europe. So that mercenary forces in a free state, whether monarchy or commonwealth, seem only necessary, either for preserving their conquests, (which in such governments it is not prudent to extend too far) or else for maintaining a war at distance.

In this last, which at present is our most important case, there are certain maxims that all wise governments have observed.

The first I shall mention is, that no private man should have a commission to be general for life,[2] let his merit and

[1] A.D. 1093. See Matthew Paris. [T. S.]

[2] Lord Campbell, in his "Lives of the Chancellors" (vol. iv., p. 322), states that Marlborough, in order to increase the confidence of the allies, proposed "he should receive a patent as commander-in-chief for life." On consulting with Lord Chancellor Cowper he was told that such a proceeding would be unconstitutional. Marlborough, however, petitioned the Queen, who rejected his application. [T. S.]

services be ever so great. Or, if a prince be unadvisedly brought to offer such a commission in one hand, let him (to save time and blood) deliver up his crown with the other. The Romans in the height and perfection of their government, usually sent out one of the new consuls to be general against their most formidable enemy, and recalled the old one, who often returned before the next election, and according as he had merit was sent to command in some other part, which perhaps was continued to him for a second, and sometimes a third year. But if Paulus Æmilius,[1] or Scipio[2] himself, had presumed to move the Senate to continue their commissions for life, they certainly would have fallen a sacrifice to the jealousy of the people. Cæsar indeed (between whom and a certain general, some of late with much discretion have made a parallel) had his command in Gaul continued to him for five years, and was afterwards made perpetual Dictator, that is to say, general for life, which gave him the power and the will of utterly destroying the Roman liberty. But in his time the Romans were very much degenerated, and great corruptions crept into their morals and discipline. However, we see there still were some remains of a noble spirit among them; for when Cæsar sent to be chosen consul, notwithstanding his absence, they decreed he should come in person, give up his command, and *petere more majorum*.[3]

[1] Æmilius Paulus, the celebrated Roman general, and conqueror of Macedonia, was twice consul, and died B.C. 160. [T. S.]

[2] Scipio Africanus, the greatest of Roman generals and the conqueror of Carthage, who died *c.* B.C. 184. [T. S.]

[3] Julius Cæsar "applied to the Senate to be exempted from the usual law, and to become a candidate in his absence" ("Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog."). This was strongly opposed; so that to be a candidate it was necessary for him "to solicit after the custom of his ancestors." [T. S.]

The "Examiner" seems to allude to the remarkable, and, to say the least, imprudent, article in "The Tatler," No. 37. Such a passage, published by so warm an adherent of Marlborough as Steele, gives credit to Macpherson's assertion, that there really was some intention of maintaining the Duke in power, by his influence in the army. It is even affirmed, that under pretence his commission under the great seal could not be superseded by the Queen's order of dismissal, it was designed that he should assemble the troops which were in town, and secure the court and capital. To prevent which, his commission was superseded by another under the great seal being issued as speedily as

It is not impossible but a general may desire such a commission out of inadvertency, at the instigation of his friends, or perhaps of his enemies, or merely for the benefit and honour of it, without intending any such dreadful consequences; and in that case, a wise prince or state may barely refuse it without shewing any marks of their displeasure. But the request in its own nature is highly criminal, and ought to be entered so upon record, to terrify others in time to come from venturing to make it.

Another maxim to be observed by a free state engaged in war, is to keep the military power in absolute subjection to the civil, nor ever suffer the former to influence or interfere with the latter. A general and his army are servants hired by the civil power to act as they are directed from thence, and with a commission large or limited as the administration shall think fit; for which they are largely paid in profit and honour. The whole system by which armies are governed, is quite alien from the peaceful institutions of states at home; and if the rewards be so inviting as to tempt a senator to take a post in the army, while he is there on his duty, he ought to consider himself in no other capacity. I know not any sort of men so apt as soldiers are, to reprimand those who presume to interfere in what relates to their trade. When they hear any of us in a coffeehouse, wondering that such a victory was not pursued, complaining that such a town cost more men and money than it was worth to take it; or that such an opportunity was lost, of fighting the enemy; they presently reprove us, and often with justice enough, for meddling in matters out of our sphere, and clearly convince us of our mistakes in terms of art that none of us understand. Nor do we escape so; for they reflect with the utmost contempt of our ignorance, that

possible. The industrious editor of "The Tatler," in 1786, is of opinion, that the article was written by Addison; but the violent counsels which it intimates seem less congenial to his character than to that of Steele, a less reflecting man, and bred a soldier. It is worthy of notice, that the passage is cancelled in all subsequent editions of "The Tatler," till restored from the original folio in that of 1786. This evidently implies Steele's own sense, that more was meant than met the ear; and it affords a presumptive proof, that very violent measures had at least been proposed, if not agreed upon, by some of Marlborough's adherents. [S.]

we who sit at home in ease and security, never stirring from our firesides, should pretend from books, and general reason, to argue upon military affairs; which after all, if we may judge from the share of intellectuals in some who are said to excel that way, is not so very profound or difficult a science. But if there be any weight in what they offer, as perhaps there may be a great deal; surely these gentlemen have a much weaker pretence to concern themselves in matters of the cabinet, which are always either far above, or much beside their capacities. Soldiers may as well pretend to prescribe rules for trade, to determine points in philosophy, to be moderators in an assembly of divines, or direct in a court of justice, as to misplace their talent in examining affairs of state, especially in what relates to the choice of ministers, who are never so likely to be ill chosen as when approved by them. It would be endless to shew how pernicious all steps of this nature have been in many parts and ages of the world. I shall only produce two at present; one in Rome, and the other in England. The first is of Cæsar, when he came to the city with his soldiers to settle the ministry, there was an end of their liberty for ever. The second was in the great rebellion against King Charles the First. The King and both Houses were agreed upon the terms of a peace, but the officers of the army (as Ludlow relates it) sets a guard upon the House of Commons, took a list of the members, and kept all by force out of the House, except those who were for bringing the King to a trial.[1] Some years after, when they erected a military government, and ruled the island by major-generals, we received most admirable instances of their skill in politics. To say the truth, such formidable sticklers[2] can have but two reasons for desiring to interfere in the administration; the first is that of Cæsar and Cromwell, of which, God forbid, I should accuse or suspect any body; since the second is perni-

[1] General Ireton and Colonel Pride placed guards outside the entrances to the House of Commons "that none might be permitted to pass into the House but such as had continued faithful to the public interest" (Ludlow's "Memoirs," vol. i., p. 270). [T. S.]

[2] The judges of the field, in a formal duel, whose duty it was to interfere when the rules of judicial combat were violated, were called sticklers, from the wooden truncheons which they held in their hands. Hence the verb to *stickle*. [S.]

cious enough, and that is, to preserve those in power who are for perpetuating a war, rather than see others advanced, who they are sure will use all proper means to promote a safe and honourable peace.

Thirdly, Since it is observed of armies, that in the present age they are brought to some degree of humanity, and a more regular demeanour to each other and to the world, than in former times; it is certainly a good maxim to endeavour preserving this temper among them, without which they would soon degenerate into savages. To this end, it would be prudent among other things, to forbid that detestable custom of drinking to the damnation or confusion of any person whatsoever.

Such desperate acts, and the opinions infused along with them, into heads already inflamed by youth and wine, are enough to scatter madness and sedition through a whole camp. So seldom upon their knees to pray, and so often to curse! This is not properly atheism, but a sort of anti-religion prescribed by the Devil, and which an atheist of common sense would scorn as an absurdity. I have heard it mentioned as a common practice last autumn, somewhere or other, to drink damnation and confusion[1] (and this with circumstances very aggravating and horrid) to the new ministry, and to those who *had any hand* in turning out the old; that is to say, to those persons whom her Majesty has thought fit to employ in her greatest affairs, with something more than a glance against the Qu[een] herself. And if it be true that these orgies were attended with certain doubtful words of standing by their g[enera]l, who without question abhorred them; let any man consider the consequence of such dispositions, if they should happen to spread. I could only wish for the honour of the Army, as well as of the Qu[een] and ministry, that a remedy had been applied to the disease, in the place and time where it grew. If men of such principles were able to propagate them in a camp, and were sure of a general for life, who had any tincture of

[1] In his "Journal to Stella" Swift writes, under date December 13th, 1710: "You hear the havoc making in the army: Meredyth, Macartney, and Col. Honeywood, are obliged to sell their commands at half value, and leave the army, for drinking destruction to the present ministry," etc. (see vol. ii., p. 71, of present edition). [T. S.]

ambition, we might soon bid farewell to ministers and parliaments, whether new or old.

I am only sorry such an accident has happened towards the close of a war, when it is chiefly the interest of those gentlemen who have posts in the army, to behave themselves in such a manner as might encourage the legislature to make some provision for them, when there will be no further need of their services. They are to consider themselves as persons by their educations unqualified for many other stations of life. Their fortunes will not suffer them to retain to a party after its fall, nor have they weight or abilities to help towards its resurrection. Their future dependence is wholly upon the prince and Parliament, to which they will never make their way, by solemn execrations of the ministry; a ministry of the Qu[een]'s own election, and fully answering the wishes of her people. This unhappy step in some of their brethren, may pass for an uncontrollable argument, that politics are not their business or their element. The fortune of war hath raised several persons up to swelling titles, and great commands over numbers of men, which they are too apt to transfer along with them into civil life, and appear in all companies as if it were at the head of their regiments, with a sort of deportment that ought to have been dropt behind, in that short passage to Harwich. It puts me in mind of a dialogue in Lucian,[1] where Charon wafting one of their predecessors over Styx, ordered him to strip off his armour and fine clothes, yet still thought him too heavy; "But" (said he) "put off likewise that pride and presumption, those high-swelling words, and that vain-glory;" because they were of no use on the other side the water. Thus if all that array of military grandeur were confined to the proper scene, it would be much more for the interest of the owners, and less offensive to their fellow subjects.[2]

[1] "Dialogues of the Dead. X. Charon, Hermes, and a number of Ghosts." Hermes required Lampichus to leave behind him his pride, folly, insolence, etc. [T. S.]

[2] Of this paper "The Medley," No. 14 (January 1st, 1710 [*sic*]), says: "He not only writes whatever he believes or knows to be false, but plainly shows 'tis his business and duty to do so, and that this alone is the merit of his service." [T. S.]

NUMB. 22.[1]

FROM THURSDAY DECEMBER 21, TO THURSDAY DECEMBER 28. 1710.[2]

Nam et, majorum instituta tueri sacris, ceremoniisque retinendis, sapientis est.

—Ruituraque semper
Stat (mirum!) moles—[3]

WHOEVER is a true lover of our constitution, must needs be pleased to see what successful endeavours are daily made to restore it in every branch to its ancient form, from the languishing condition it hath long lain in, and with such deadly symptoms.

I have already handled some abuses during the late management, and shall in convenient time go on with the rest. Hitherto I have confined myself to those of the State; but with the good leave of those who think it a matter of small moment, I shall now take liberty to say something of the Church.[4]

For several years past, there hath not I think in Europe,

[1] No. 21 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Under date January 1st, 171$\frac{0}{1}$, Swift writes to Stella: "Get the 'Examiners,' and read them; the last nine or ten are full of the reasons for the late change, and of the abuses of the last ministry; and the great men assure me they are all true. They are written by their encouragement and direction" (vol. ii., p. 88, of present edition). [T. S.]

[3] "For it is the part of a wise man to defend the institutions of his forefathers, and uphold the sacred rites and ceremonies.

And ever threatening to fall
The mass—a marvel—stands."

[T. S.]

[4] A pamphlet, ascribed to W. Wotton, was issued in reply to this paper. It was entitled, "The Case of the Present Convocation Consider'd; In Answer to the Examiner's Unfair Representation of it, and Unjust Reflections upon it." 1711.

been any society of men upon so unhappy a foot, as the clergy of England, nor more hardly treated, by those very persons from whom they deserved much better quarter, and in whose power they chiefly had put it to use them so ill. I would not willingly misrepresent facts; but I think it generally allowed by enemies and friends, that the bold and brave defences made before the Revolution against those many invasions of our rights, proceeded principally from the clergy; who are likewise known to have rejected all advances made them to close with the measures at that time concerting; while the Dissenters, to gratify their ambition and revenge, fell into the basest compliances with the court, approved of all proceedings by their numerous and fulsome addresses, and took employments and commissions by virtue of the dispensing power, against the direct laws of the land. All this is so true, that if ever the Pretender comes in, they will, next to those of his own religion, have the fairest claim and pretensions to his favour, from their merit and eminent services to his supposed father, who, without such encouragement, would probably never have been misled to go the lengths he did. It should likewise be remembered to the everlasting honour of the London divines, that in those dangerous times, they writ and published the best collection of arguments against Popery, that ever appeared in the world. At the Revolution, the body of the clergy joined heartily in the common cause (except a few, whose sufferings perhaps have atoned for their mistakes) like men who are content to go about, for avoiding a gulf or a precipice, but come into the old straight road again as soon as they can. But another temper had now begun to prevail. For as in the reign of K. Charles the First, several well-meaning people were ready to join in reforming some abuses; while others who had deeper designs, were still calling out for a thorough reformation, which ended at last in the ruin of the kingdom; so after the late king's coming to the throne, there was a restless cry from men of the same principles, for a thorough revolution, which as some were

[1] The Dissenters were at first disposed to make common cause with the Catholics in favour of the dispensing power claimed by James II.; and an address from the Presbyterians went so far as to praise the king for having "restored to God His empire over conscience." [S.]

carrying it on, must have ended in the destruction of the Monarchy and Church.

What a violent humour hath run ever since against the clergy, and from what corner spread and fomented, is, I believe, manifest to all men. It looked like a set quarrel against Christianity, and if we call to mind several of the leaders, it must in a great measure have been actually so. Nothing was more common in writing and conversation, than to hear that reverend body charged in gross with what was utterly inconsistent: despised for their poverty, hated for their riches; reproached with avarice, and taxed with luxury; accused for promoting arbitrary power, and resisting the prerogative; censured for their pride, and scorned for their meanness of spirit. The representatives of the lower clergy railed at for disputing the power of the bishops, by the known abhorrers of episcopacy; and abused for doing nothing in their convocations, by those very men who helped to bind up their hands. The vice, the folly, the ignorance of every single man, were laid upon the character; their jurisdiction, censures and discipline trampled under foot, yet mighty complaints against their excessive power.[1] The men of wit employed to turn the priesthood itself into ridicule. In short, groaning every where under the weight of poverty, oppression, contempt and obloquy. A fair return for the time and money spent in their education to fit them for the service of the Altar; and a fair encouragement for worthy men to come into the Church. However, it may be some comfort for persons of that holy function, that their Divine Founder as well as His harbinger, met with the like reception. "John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say he hath a devil; the Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, behold a glutton and a wine-bibber, &c."

In this deplorable state of the clergy, nothing but the hand of Providence, working by its glorious instrument, the

[1] "The Case etc. Consider'd," remarks: "The boldest, and the most insolent book of that sort, is the 'Rights of the Church' . . . Yet how long was Dr. T[inda]ll, then Fellow of All Souls, suffered at Oxford after the 'Rights' appeared?" Dr. Matthew Tindal, author of "The Rights of the Christian Church" (1706), was a fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, from 1678 till his death in 1733. [T. S.]

QUEEN, could have been able to turn the people's hearts so surprisingly in their favour. This Princess, destined for the safety of Europe, and a blessing to her subjects, began her reign with a noble benefaction to the Church;[1] and it was hoped the nation would have followed such an example, which nothing could have prevented, but the false politics of a set of men, who form their maxims upon those of every tottering commonwealth, which is always struggling for life, subsisting by expedients, and often at the mercy of any powerful neighbour. These men take it into their imagination, that trade can never flourish unless the country becomes a common receptacle for all nations, religions and languages; a system only proper for small popular states, but altogether unworthy, and below the dignity of an imperial crown; which with us is best upheld by a monarch in possession of his just prerogative, a senate of nobles and of commons, and a clergy established in its due rights with a suitable maintenance by law. But these men come with the spirit of shopkeepers to frame rules for the administration of kingdoms; or, as if they thought the whole art of government consisted in the importation of nutmegs, and the curing of herrings. Such an island as ours can afford enough to support the majesty of a crown, the honour of a nobility, and the dignity of a magistracy; we can encourage arts and sciences, maintain our bishops and clergy, and suffer our gentry to live in a decent, hospitable manner; yet still there will remain hands sufficient for trade and manufactures, which do always indeed deserve the best encouragement, but not to a degree of sending every living soul into the warehouse or the workhouse.

This pedantry of republican politics hath done infinite mischief among us. To this we owe those noble schemes of treating Christianity as a system of speculative opinions,

[1] "At this time [February, 170$\frac{3}{4}$] Queen Anne gave up the *first-fruits* and *tenths*, which had long been possessed by the crown, to be appropriated to a fund for the increase of small livings. This fund is known as Queen Anne's Bounty" (Lathbury's "Hist. of Convocation," second edition, p. 386). The Queen's Message to Parliament was dated February 7th, 170$\frac{3}{4}$, and the Bill was introduced February 17th, and received the royal assent April 3rd, 1704. See also Swift's "Answer" in the following number. [T. S.]

which no man should be bound to believe; of making the being and the worship of God, a creature of the state. In consequence of these, that the teachers of religion ought to hold their maintenance at pleasure, or live by the alms and charitable collection of the people, and be equally encouraged of all opinions: that they should be prescribed what to teach, by those who are to learn from them; and, upon default, have a staff and a pair of shoes left at their door;[1] with many other projects of equal piety, wisdom, and good nature.

But, God be thanked, they and their schemes are vanished, and "their places shall know them no more." When I think of that inundation of atheism, infidelity, profaneness and licentiousness which were like to overwhelm us, from what mouths and hearts it first proceeded, and how the people joined with the Queen's endeavours to divert this flood, I cannot but reflect on that remarkable passage in the Revelation,[2] where "the serpent with seven heads cast out of his mouth water after the woman like a flood, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood: But the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed up the flood which the dragon had cast out of his mouth." For the Queen having changed her ministry suitable to her own wisdom, and the wishes of her subjects, and having called a free Parliament; at the same time summoned the convocation, by her royal writ,[3] "as in all times had been accustomed," and soon after their meeting, sent a most gracious letter[4] to the Archbishop of Canterbury,

[1] A hint to withdraw. [T. S.]
This is said to have been the mode in which the governors of a Dutch province were wont to give intimation to those who intermeddled with state affairs, that they would do wisely to withdraw themselves from the state. [S.]

[2] Swift notices his own misquotation in the succeeding number (*q. v.*). See a further reference to the subject in No. 26. [T. S.]

[3] Convocation was assembled on November 25th, and the Latin sermon preached by Kennet. [T. S.]

[4] Queen Anne's letter was printed in "The Daily Courant" for December 19th. It is dated December 12th, and says: "It is with great grief of heart we observe the scandalous attempts which of late years have been made to infect the minds of our good subjects by loose and profane principles openly scattered and propagated among them. We think the consultations of the clergy particularly requisite to repress

to be communicated to the bishops and clergy of his province; taking notice of "the loose and profane principles which had been openly scattered and propagated among her subjects: that the consultations of the clergy were particularly requisite to repress and prevent such daring attempts, for which her subjects, from all parts of the kingdom, have shown their just abhorrence. She hopes, the endeavours of the clergy, in this respect, will not be unsuccessful; and for her part, is ready to give them all fit encouragement, to proceed in the dispatch of such business as properly belongs to them; and to grant them powers requisite to carry on so good a work." In conclusion, "earnestly recommending to them, to avoid disputes, and determining to do all that in her lies to compose and extinguish them."

It is to be hoped, that this last part of her Majesty's letter, will be the first she will please to execute; for, it seems, this very letter created the first dispute.[1] The fact whereof is thus related: The Upper House having formed an address to the QUEEN, before they received her Majesty's letter, sent both address and letter together, to the Lower House, with a message, excusing their not mentioning the letter in the address, because this was formed

these daring attempts and to prevent the like for the future. The just abhorrence that our subjects from all parts of the kingdom have expressed of such wicked principles and their abettors, give us good ground to hope that the endeavours of the clergy in this respect will not be unsuccessful. For our part we are ready to give them all fitting encouragement to proceed in the dispatch of such business as properly belongs to them, and to grant them such powers as shall be thought requisite," etc. [T. S.]

[1] The Queen's letter was intended to put an end to disputes in Convocation. She expressed her hope that her royal intentions would not be frustrated "by any unseasonable disputes between the two Houses of Convocation about unnecessary forms and methods of proceeding." She earnestly recommended that such disputes might cease. The bishops prepared an address, but the Lower House insisted "on the enlarging the fourth paragraph, and upon answering the several heads of the Queen's letter" (Chamberlen's "History of Queen Anne," p. 365, and "Daily Courant," Dec. 19th). The real reason for the disputes between the two Houses at this time lay in the fact that the Upper House, owing to Tenison's influence, was largely Low Church in sympathy, whereas the Lower House, with Atterbury as its leader, was of the High Church party. [T. S.]

before the other was received:[1] The Lower House returned them, with a desire, that an address might be formed, with due regard and acknowledgments for the letter. After some difficulties, the same address was sent down again with a clause inserted, making some short mention of the said letter. This the Lower House did not think sufficient, and sent it back again with the same request: whereupon the archbishop, after a short consultation with *some* of his brethren, immediately adjourned the convocation for a month, and no address at all was sent to the QUEEN.

I understand not ecclesiastical affairs well enough to comment upon this matter;[2] but it seems to me, that all methods of doing service to the Church and kingdom, by means of a convocation, may be at any time eluded, if there be no remedy against such an incident. And if this proceeding be agreeable to the institution, spiritual assemblies must needs be strangely contrived, very different from any lay senate yet known in the world. Surely, from the nature of such a synod, it must be a very unhappy circumstance, when the majority of the bishops draws one way, and that of the lower clergy another. The latter, I think, are not at this time suspected for any principles bordering upon those professed by enemies to episcopacy; and if they happen to differ from the greater part of the present set of bishops, I doubt it will call some things to mind, that may turn the scale of general favour on the inferior clergy's side, who with a profound duty to her Majesty, are perfectly pleased with the present turn of affairs. Besides, curious people will be apt to enquire into the dates of some promotions, to call to mind what designs were then upon the anvil, and from thence make malicious deductions. Perhaps they will observe the manner of voting on the bishops' bench, and compare it with what shall pass in the upper house of convocation. There is, however, one comfort, that

[1] Dr. Smalridge (1662-1719) called for the Queen's letter to be read. The Archbishop prorogued Convocation for two days, and then again until January 17th. An address to the Queen was presented on January 26th (Lathbury's "History of Convocation," second edition, p. 407). Smalridge was Dean of Carlisle, 1711-13, and Bishop of Bristol, 1714-19. [T. S.]

[2] "The Case etc. Consider'd" quotes on the title-page: "Jude 10. But these speak evil of those things which they know not." [T. S.]

under the present dispositions of the kingdom, a dislike to the proceedings of any of their lordships, even to the number of a majority, will be purely personal, and not turned to the disadvantage of the order. And for my part, as I am a true lover of the Church, I had rather find the inclinations of the people favourable to episcopacy in general, than see a majority of prelates cried up by those who are known enemies to the character. Nor, indeed, hath anything given me more offence for several years past, than to observe how some of that bench have been caressed by certain persons; and others of them openly celebrated by the infamous pens of atheists, republicans and fanatics.

Time and mortality can only remedy these inconveniencies in the Church, which are not to be cured like those in the State, by a change of ministry. If we may guess the temper of a convocation, from the choice of a prolocutor,[1] as it is usual to do that of a House of Commons by the speaker, we may expect great things from that reverend body, who have done themselves much reputation, by pitching upon a gentleman of so much piety, wit and learning, for that office; and one who is so thoroughly versed in those parts of knowledge which are proper for it. I am sorry that the three Latin speeches, delivered upon presenting the prolocutor, were not made public;[2] they might perhaps have given us some light into the dispositions of each house: and besides, one of them is said to be so peculiar in the style and matter, as might have made up in entertainment what it wanted in instruction.

[1] "Dr. Atterbury, in preference to Dr. Kennet, was chosen prolocutor by a great majority."—TINDAL, iv. 206. [T. S.]

[2] The Latin speeches were made on December 6th, when the prolocutor was presented to the Archbishop, by Dr. Smalridge, Atterbury, and Tenison. The one speech to which Swift refers may have been Tenison's, whose style was fairly dull. [T. S.]

NUMB. 23.[1]

FROM THURSDAY DECEMBER 28, TO THURSDAY JANUARY 4. 1710.[2]

Nullae sunt occultiores insidiae, quam eae quae latent in simulatione officii, aut in aliquo necessitudinis nomine.[3]

The following answer is written in the true style, and with the usual candour of such pieces; which I have imitated to the best of my skill, and doubt not but the reader will be extremely satisfied with it.

The Examiner cross-examined, or, A full Answer to the last Examiner.

IF I durst be so bold with this author, I would gladly ask him a familiar question; Pray, Sir, who made you an Examiner? He talks in one of his insipid papers, of eight or nine thousand corruptions,[4] while *we* were at the head of affairs, yet, in all this time, he has hardly produced fifty:

Parturiunt montes, &c.[5]

But I shall confine myself, at present, to his last paper. He tells us, "The Queen began her reign with a noble benefaction to the Church." Here's priestcraft with a witness; this is the constant language of your highfliers, to call those who are hired to teach *the religion of the magistrate* by the

[1] No. 22 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] *I. e.* 1710-11. [T. S.]

[3] Cicero, "in Verrem," II. i. 15: "There are no intrigues more difficult to guard against than those which are concealed under a pretence of duty, or under the name of some intimate connexion."—C. D. YONGE. [T. S.]

[4] See No. 19, *ante* (not quoted correctly). [T. S.]

[5] Horace, "Ars Poetica," 139:

"The mountains laboured with prodigious throes."—P. FRANCIS. [T. S.]

name of the Church.[1] But this is not all; for, in the very next line he says, "It was hoped the nation would have followed this example." You see the faction begins already to speak out; this is an open demand for the abbey-lands; this furious zealot would have us priest-ridden again, like our popish ancestors: but, it is to be hoped the government will take timely care to suppress such audacious attempts, else we have spent so much blood and treasure to very little purpose, in maintaining religion and Revolution. But what can we expect from a man, who at one blow endeavours to ruin our trade? "A country" (says he) "may flourish" (these are his own words) "without being the common receptacle for all nations, religions, and languages." What! We must immediately banish or murder the Palatines; forbid all foreign merchants, not only the Exchange, but the kingdom; persecute the Dissenters with fire and faggot, and make it high-treason to speak any other tongue but English. In another place he talks of a "serpent with seven heads," which is a manifest corruption of the text; for the words "*seven heads*," are not mentioned in that verse.[2] However, we know what serpent he would mean; a serpent with fourteen legs; or, indeed, no serpent at all, but seven great men, who were the best ministers, the truest Protestants, and the most disinterested patriots that ever served a prince.[3] But nothing is so inconsistent as this writer; I know not whether to call him a Whig or a Tory, a Protestant or a Papist; he finds fault with convocations; says, "they are assemblies strangely contrived;" and yet lays the fault upon us, that we bound their hands: I wish we could have bound their tongues too; but as fast as their hands were bound, they could make a shift to hold their pens, and have their share in the guilt of ruining the hopefullest party and ministry that ever prescribed to a crown. This captious gentleman is angry to "see a majority of prelates cried up by those who

[1] See No. 22, *ante*. [T. S.]

[2] The serpent, or dragon, is said to have seven heads in an earlier verse of the same chapter. See Rev. xii., 3, 9, 15. [T. S.]

[3] The Earl of Sunderland and Henry Boyle (Secretaries of State), Earl of Godolphin (Lord Treasurer), Lord Somers (President of the Council), Lord Cowper (Lord Chancellor), Duke of Marlborough (Captain General), and Horatio Walpole (Secretary of War). [T. S.]

are enemies to the character"; now I always thought, that the concessions of enemies were more to a man's advantage than the praise of his friends. "Time and mortality," he says, "can only remedy these inconveniencies in the Church." That is, in other words, when certain bishops are dead, we shall have others of our own stamp. Not so fast; you are not yet so sure of your game. We have already got one comfortable loss in Spain, though by a G[enera]l of our own.[1] For joy of which, our J[un]to had a merry meeting at the house of their great proselyte, on the very day we received the happy news. One or two more such blows would, perhaps, set us right again, and then we can employ "mortality" as well as others. He concludes with wishing, that "three letters, spoke when the prolocutor was presented, were made public." I suppose he would be content with one, and that is more than we shall humour him to grant. However, I hope he will allow it possible to have grace, without either eloquence or Latin, which is all I shall say to his malicious innuendo.

Having thus, I hope, given a full and satisfactory answer to the Examiner's last paper, I shall now go on to a more important affair; which is, to prove, by several undeniable instances, that the late m[inist]ry, and their abettors, were true friends to the Church. It is yet, I confess, a secret to the clergy, wherein this friendship did consist. For information therefore of that reverend body, that they may never forget their benefactors, as well as of all others who may be equally ignorant, I have determined to display *our* merits to the world upon that weighty article. And I could wish, that what I am to say were to be written in brass, for an eternal memorial; the rather, because for the future, the Church must endeavour to stand unsupported by those patrons, who expired in doing it their last good office, and will never rise to preserve it any more.

[1] General Stanhope, at Brihuega, was surprised and compelled to surrender on December 9th, 1710. Oldmixon's "Sequel" (p. 452) remarks: "The misfortune which happened to General Stanhope at Brihuega, where he was surrounded by the French and Spanish armies, and after a most gallant defence, obliged to surrender himself with several English battalions prisoners of war, was some relief to high-church; . . . they did not stick to rejoice at it." [T. S.]

Let us therefore produce the pious endeavours of these church-defenders, who were its patrons by their power and authority, as well as ornaments of it by their exemplary lives.

First, St. Paul tells us, "there must be heresies in the Church, that the truth may be manifest"; and therefore, by due course of reasoning, the more heresies there are, the more manifest will the truth be made. This being maturely considered by these lovers of the Church, they endeavoured to propagate as many heresies as they could, that the light of truth might shine the clearer.

Secondly, To shew their zeal for the Church's defence, they took the care of it entirely out of the hands of God Almighty (because that was a foreign jurisdiction) and made it their own creature, depending altogether upon them; and issued out their orders to Tindal, and others, to give public notice of it.

Thirdly, Because charity is the most celebrated of all Christian virtues, therefore they extended theirs beyond all bounds; and instead of shutting the Church against Dissenters, were ready to open it to all comers, and break down its walls, rather than that any should want room to enter. The strength of a state, we know, consists in the number of people, how different soever in their callings; and why should not the strength of a Church consist in the same, how different soever in their creeds? For that reason, they charitably attempted to abolish the test, which tied up so many hands from getting employments, in order to protect the Church.

I know very well that this attempt is objected to us as a crime, by several malignant Tories, and denied as a slander by many unthinking people among ourselves. The latter are apt in their defence to ask such questions as these; Was your test repealed?[1] Had we not a majority? Might we not have done it if we pleased? To which the others answer, You did what you could; you prepared the way, but you found a fatal impediment from that quarter, whence the sanction of the law must come, and therefore to save your credit, you condemned a paper to be burnt which yourselves

[1] The Test Act was passed in 1672 and repealed only in 1828. [T. S.]

had brought in.[1] But alas! the miscarriage of that noble project for the safety of the Church, had another original; the knowledge whereof depends upon a piece of secret history that I shall now lay open.

These church-protectors had directed a Presbyterian preacher to draw up a bill for repealing the test; it was accordingly done with great art, and in the preamble, several expressions of civility to the established Church; and when it came to the qualifications of all those who were to enter on any office, the compiler had taken special care to make them large enough for all Christians whatsoever, by transcribing the very words (only formed into an oath) which Quakers are obliged to profess by a former Act of Parliament; as I shall here set them down.[2] "I *A.B.* profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ His eternal Son, the true God, and in the Holy Spirit one God blessed for evermore; and do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration." This bill was carried to the chief leaders for their approbation, with these terrible words turned into an oath: What should they do? Those few among them who fancied they believed in God, were sure they did not believe in Christ, or the Holy Spirit, or one syllable of the Bible; and they were as sure that every body knew their opinion in those matters, which indeed they had been always too sincere to disguise; how therefore could they take such an oath as that, without ruining their reputation with Tindal, Toland,[3] Coward,[4] Collins, Clendon,[5] and all the tribe of free-thinkers,

[1] This paper was a pamphlet by Charles Leslie, published October, 1708, which was condemned to be burnt by the House of Commons in January, $17\frac{0}{1}\frac{8}{9}$. It was entitled, "A Letter from a Gentleman in Scotland to his Friend in England, against the Sacramental Test." [T. S.]

[2] This declaration was prescribed by the Act 1 William and Mary, c. 18, s. 13. It was repealed in 1871. [T. S.]

[3] John Toland, author of "Christianity not Mysterious" (1696) and other works. See note on p. 9 of vol. iii. of present edition. [T. S.]

[4] William Coward (1656-1725), physician, was the author of "Second Thoughts Concerning Human Soul" (1702), and "The Grand Essay; or A Vindication of Reason and Religion" ($170\frac{3}{4}$). Both these works were ordered by the House of Commons to be burnt, March 17th, $170\frac{3}{4}$. See also note on p. 9 of vol. iii. of present edition. [T. S.]

[5] John Clendon was the author of "A Treatise of the Word Person"

and so give a scandal to weak unbelievers. Upon this nice point of honour and conscience the matter was hushed, the project for repealing the test let fall, and the Sacrament left as the smaller evil of the two.

Fourthly, These pillars of the Church, because "the harvest was great, and the labourers few," and because they would ease the bishops from that grievous trouble of laying on hands: were willing to allow that power to all men whatsoever, to prevent that terrible consequence of unchurching those, who thought a hand from under a cloak as effectual as from lawn-sleeves. And indeed, what could more contribute to the advancement of true religion, than a bill of general naturalization for priesthood?

Fifthly, In order to fix religion in the minds of men, because truth never appears so fair as when confronted with falsehood; they directed books to be published, that denied the being of a God, the divinity of the Second and Third Person, the truth of all revelation, and the immortality of the soul. To this we owe that great sense of religion, that respect and kindness to the clergy, and that true love of virtue so manifest of late years among the youth of our nation. Nor could anything be more discreet, than to leave the merits of each cause to such wise impartial judges, who might otherwise fall under the slavery of believing by education and prejudice.

Sixthly, Because nothing so much distracts the thoughts, as too great a variety of subjects; therefore they had kindly prepared a bill, to prescribe the clergy what subjects they should preach upon, and in what manner, that they might be at no loss; and this no doubt, was a proper work for such hands, so thoroughly versed in the theory and practice of all Christian duties.

Seventhly, To save trouble and expense to the clergy, they contrived that convocations should meet as seldom as possible; and when they were suffered to assemble, would never allow them to meddle with any business; because they said, the office of a clergyman was enough to take up the whole man. For the same reason they were very desirous to excuse the bishops from sitting in Parliament, that they might

(17$\frac{9}{10}$) which the House of Commons ordered to be burnt, March 24, 17$\frac{9}{10}$. See also note on p. 185 of vol. iii. of present edition. [T. S.]

be at more leisure to stay at home and look after their clergy.

I shall mention at present but one more instance of their pious zeal for the Church. They had somewhere heard the maxim, that *Sanguis martyrum est semen ecclesiae;*[1] therefore, in order to sow this seed, they began with impeaching a clergyman: and that it might be a true martyrdom in every circumstance, they proceeded as much as possible against common law,[2] which the long-robe part of the managers knew was in a hundred instances directly contrary to all their positions, and were sufficiently warned of it beforehand; but their love of the Church prevailed. Neither was this impeachment an affair taken up on a sudden. For, a certain great person (whose Character has been lately published by some stupid and lying writer)[3] who very much distinguished himself by his zeal in forwarding this impeachment, had several years ago endeavoured to persuade the late King to give way to just such another attempt. He told his Majesty, there was a certain clergyman preached very dangerous sermons, and that the only way to put a stop to such insolence, was to impeach him in Parliament. The King enquired the character of the man; "O, sir," said my lord, "the most violent, hot, positive fellow in England; so extremely wilful, that I believe he would be heartily glad to be a martyr." The King answered, "Is it so? Then I am resolved to disappoint him"; and would never hear more of the matter; by which that hopeful project unhappily miscarried.

I have hitherto confined myself to those endeavours for the good of the Church, which were common to all the

[1] "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church." [T. S.]

[2] For preaching a sermon at St. Paul's on "Perils from false brethren" (November 5th, 1709), Dr. Sacheverell was, on the complaint of Mr. Dolben (December 13th), impeached in the House of Commons on December 14th, 1709, and in the House of Lords on December 15th. The sermon was printed and widely circulated, and Sacheverell received for it the thanks of the Lord Mayor. Mr. Dolben objected to Godolphin being referred to as Volpone. Out of this arose the famous Sacheverell trial, so disastrous in its effect on the Whig ministry. [T. S.]

[3] Lord Wharton. See vol. v., pp. 1-28 of present edition of Swift's Works. [T. S.]

leaders and principal men of our party; but if my paper were not drawing towards an end, I could produce several instances of particular persons, who by their exemplary lives and actions have confirmed the character so justly due to the whole body. I shall at present mention only two, and illustrate the merits of each by a matter of fact.

That worthy patriot, and true lover of the Church, whom the late "Examiner" is supposed to reflect on under the name of Verres,[1] felt a pious impulse to be a benefactor to the Cathedral of Gloucester, but how to do it in the most decent, generous manner, was the question. At last he thought of an expedient: One morning or night he stole into the Church, mounted upon the altar, and there did that which in cleanly phrase is called disburthening of nature: He was discovered, prosecuted, and condemned to pay a thousand pounds, which sum was all employed to support the Church, as, no doubt, the benefactor meant it.

There is another person whom the same writer is thought to point at under the name of Will Bigamy.[2] This gentleman, knowing that marriage fees were a considerable perquisite to the clergy, found out a way of improving them *cent. per cent.* for the good of the Church. His invention was to marry a second wife while the first was alive, convincing her of the lawfulness by such arguments, as he did not doubt would make others follow the same example: These he had drawn up in writing with intention to publish for the general good; and it is hoped he may now have leisure to finish them.[3]

[1] Lord Wharton. But see correction in No. 25, *post.* [T. S.]
[2] See previous note on Lord Cowper. [T.S.]
[3] Cowper was at this time out of office. [T. S.]

NUMB. 24.[1]

FROM THURSDAY JANUARY 4, TO THURSDAY JANUARY 11. 1710.[2]

Bellum ita suscipiatur, ut nihil aliud nisi Pax quaesita videatur.[3]

I AM satisfied, that no reasonable man of either party, can justly be offended at any thing I said in one of my papers relating to the Army;[4] from the maxims I there laid down, perhaps many persons may conclude, that I had a mind the world should think, there had been occasion given by some late abuses among men of that calling; and they conclude right. For my intention is, that my hints may be understood, and my quotations and allegories applied; and I am in some pain to think, that in the Orcades on one side, and the western coasts of Ireland on the other, the "Examiner" may want a key in several parts, which I wish I could furnish them with. As for the French king, I am under no concern at all; I hear he has left off reading my papers, and by what he has found in them, dislikes our proceedings more than ever, and intends either to make great additions to his armies, or propose new terms for a peace: So false is that which is commonly reported, of his mighty satisfaction in our change of ministry: And I think it clear that his late letter of "Thanks to the Tories of Great Britain,"[5]

[1] No. 23 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] *I.e.* 1710-11. [T. S.]

[3] Cicero, "De Officiis," i. 23: "In the undertaking of a war there should be such a prospect, as if the only end of it were peace."—SIR R. L'ESTRANGE. [T. S.]

[4] See "Examiner," No. 21. [T. S.]

[5] Scott mistakes this as the pretended letter quoted in "The Medley," No. 14. Swift refers to a half sheet printed for A. Baldwin in the latter part of 1710, and entitled: "The French King's Thanks to the Tories of Great-Britain." It was ascribed to Hoadly.

In this print Louis XIV. is made to thank the Tories for "what

must either have been extorted from him against his judgment, or was a cast of his politics to set the people against the present ministry, wherein it has wonderfully succeeded.

But though I have never heard, or never regarded any objections made against that paper, which mentions the army; yet I intended this as a sort of apology for it. And first, I declare, (because we live in a mistaking world) that in hinting at some proceedings, wherein a few persons are said to be concerned, I did not intend to charge them upon the body of the army. I have too much detested that barbarous injustice among the writers of a late party, to be ever guilty of it myself; I mean the accusing societies for the crimes of a few. On the other side, I must take leave to believe, that armies are no more exempt from corruptions than other numbers of men. The maxims proposed were occasionally introduced by the report of certain facts, which I am bound to believe is true, because I am sure, considering what has passed, it would be a crime to think otherwise. All posts in the army, all employments at court, and many others, are (or ought to be) given and resumed at the mere

hath given me too deep and lasting impressions of respect, and gratitude, ever to be forgotten. If I should endeavour to recount all the numerous obligations I have to you, I should not know where to begin, nor where to make an end. . . . To you and your predecessors I owe that supineness and negligence of the English court, which gave me opportunity and ability to form and prosecute my designs." Alluding to William III. he says: "To you I owed the impotence of his life and the comfort of his death. At that juncture how vast were my hopes? . . . But a princess ascended your throne, whom you seemed to court with some personal fondness . . . She had a general whom her predecessor had wrought into the confidence and favour of the Allies. . . . It is with pleasure I have observed, that every victory he hath obtained abroad, hath been retrieved by your management at home. . . . What a figure have your tumults, your addresses, and the progresses of your Doctor, made in my Gazettes? What comfort have I received from them? . . . And with what impatience do we now wait for that dissolution, with the hopes of which you have so long flattered us? . . . Blessed be the engines, to which so glorious events are owing. Republican, Antimonarchical, Danger of the Church, Non-resistance, Hereditary and Divine Right, words of force and energy! . . . How great are my obligations to all these!" In a postscript, King Louis is made to say further: "My Brother of England [*i.e.* the Pretender] . . . thanks you for . . . your late loyal addresses; your open avowal in them of that unlimited non-resistance by which he keeps up his claim," etc. [T. S.]

pleasure of the prince: yet when I see a great officer broke, a change made in the court or the ministry, and this under the most just and gracious Princess that ever reigned, I must naturally conclude it is done upon prudent considerations, and for some great demerit in the sufferers. But then; is not the punishment sufficient? Is it generous or charitable to trample on the unfortunate, and expose their faults to the world in the strongest colours? And would it not suit better with magnanimity as well as common good-nature, to leave them at quiet to their own thoughts and repentance? Yes without question, provided it could be so contrived that their very names, as well as actions, might be forgotten for ever; *such* an act of oblivion would be for the honour of our nation, and beget a better opinion of us with posterity; and then I might have spared the world and myself the trouble of *examining*. But at present, there is a cruel dilemma in the case: The friends and abettors of the late ministry are every day publishing their praises to the world, and casting reflections upon the present persons in power. This is so barefaced an aspersion upon the Q[ueen], that I know not how any good subject can with patience endure it, though he were ever so indifferent with regard to the opinions in dispute. Shall they who have lost all power and love of the people, be allowed to scatter their poison; and shall not those, who are, at least, of the strongest side, be suffered to bring an antidote? And how can we undeceive the deluded remainder, but by letting them see, that those discarded statesmen were justly laid aside, and producing as many instances to prove it as we can? not from any personal hatred to them, but in justification to the best of queens. The many scurrilities I have heard and read against this poor paper of mine, are in such a strain, that considering the present state of affairs, they look like a jest. They usually run after the following manner: "What? shall this insolent writer presume to censure the late ministry, the ablest, the most faithful, and truest lovers of their country, and its constitution that ever served a prince? Shall he reflect on the best H[ouse] of C[ommons] that ever sat within those walls? Has not the Queen changed both for a ministry and Parliament of Jacobites and highfliers, who are selling us to France, and bringing over the Pretender?" This is the very sum

and force of all their reasonings, and this their method of complaining against the "Examiner." In *them* it is humble and loyal to reflect upon the Q[ueen] and the ministry, and Parliament she has chosen with the universal applause of her people; in *us* it is insolent to defend her Majesty and her choice, or to answer their objections, by shewing the reasons why those changes were necessary.

The same style has been used in the late case relating to some gentlemen in the army;[1] such a clamour was raised by a set of men, who had the boldness to tax the administration with cruelty and injustice, that I thought it necessary to interfere a little, by shewing the ill consequences that might arise from some proceedings, though without application to particular persons. And what do they offer in answer? Nothing but a few poor common-places against calumny and informers, which might have been full as just and seasonable in a plot against the sacred person of the Q[ueen].

But, by the way; why are these idle people so indiscreet to name those two words, which afford occasion of laying open to the world such an infamous scene of subornation and perjury, as well as calumny and informing, as I believe is without example: when a whole cabal attempted an action, wherein a condemned criminal refused to join with them for the reward of his life?[2] Not that I disapprove their sagacity, who could foretell so long before, by what hand they should one day fall, and therefore thought any means justifiable by which they might prevent it.

But waiving this at present, it must be owned in justice to the army, that those violences did not proceed so far among them as some have believed; nor ought the madness of a few to be laid at their doors. For the rest, I am so far from denying the due praises to those victorious troops, who did their part in procuring so many victories for the allies, that

[1] "Lieut.-Gen. Meredith, Major-Gen. Macartney, and Brigadier Honeywood were superseded, upon an information laid before the Q——, that these three gentlemen had, in their cups, drank Damnation and Confusion to the new ministry, and to those who had any hand in turning out of the old."—TINDAL, iv. 195. See also No. 21 and note, p. 127. [T. S.]

[2] William Gregg, a clerk in Harley's office, who was convicted of a treasonable correspondence with France. See Swift's "Some Remarks," etc., in vol. v., p. 38, of present edition. [T. S.]

I could wish every officer and private soldier had their full share of honour in proportion to their deserts; being thus far of the Athenians' mind, who when it was proposed that the statue of Miltiades should be set up alone in some public place of the city, said they would agree to it, *whenever he conquered alone*, but not before. Neither do I at all blame the officers of the army, for preferring in their hearts the late ministry before the present; or, if wishing alone could be of any use, to wish their continuance, because then they might be secure of the war's continuance too: whereas, since affairs have been put into other hands, they may perhaps lie under some apprehensions of a peace, which no army, especially in a course of success, was ever inclined to, and which all wise states have in such a juncture, chiefly endeavoured. This is a point wherein the civil and military politics have always disagreed. And for that reason, I affirmed it necessary in all free governments, that the latter should be absolutely in subjection to the former; otherwise, one of these two inconveniencies must arise, either to be perpetually in war, or to turn the civil institution into a military.

I am ready to allow all that has been said of the valour and experience of our troops, who have fully contributed their part to the great successes abroad; nor is it their fault, that those important victories had no better consequences at home, though it may be their advantage. War is their trade and business: to improve and cultivate the advantages of success, is an affair of the cabinet; and the neglect of this, whether proceeding from weakness or corruption, according to the usual uncertainty of wars, may be of the most fatal consequence to a nation. For, pray let me represent our condition in such a light, as I believe both parties will allow, though perhaps not the consequences I shall deduce from it. We have been for above nine years, blessed with a QUEEN, who besides all virtues that can enter into the composition of a private person, possesses every regal quality that can contribute to make a people happy: of great wisdom, yet ready to receive the advice of her counsellors: of much discernment in choosing proper instruments, when she follows her own judgment, and only capable of being deceived by that excess of goodness which makes her judge of others by herself. Frugal in her management in order to contribute to

the public, which in proportion she does, and that voluntarily, beyond any of her subjects; but from her own nature, generous and charitable to all that want or deserve; and in order to exercise those virtues, denying herself all entertainments of expense which many others enjoy. Then if we look abroad, at least in Flanders, our arms have been crowned with perpetual success in battles and sieges, not to mention several fortunate actions in Spain. These facts being thus stated, which none can deny, it is natural to ask how we have improved such advantages, and to what account they have turned? I shall use no discouraging terms. When a patient grows daily worse by the tampering of mountebanks, there is nothing left but to call in the best physicians before the case grows desperate: But I would ask, whether France or any other kingdom, would have made so little use of such prodigious opportunities, the fruits whereof could never have fallen to the ground, without the extremest degree of folly and corruption, and where those have lain, let the world judge? Instead of aiming at peace, while we had the advantage of the war, which has been the perpetual maxim of all wise states, it has been reckoned factious and malignant even to express our wishes for it; and such a condition imposed, as was never offered to any prince who had an inch of ground to dispute; *Quae enim est conditio pacis; in qua ei cum quo pacem facias, nihil concedi potest?*[1]

It is not obvious to conceive what could move men who sat at home, and were called to consult upon the good of the kingdom, to be so utterly averse from putting an end to a long expensive war, which the victorious, as well as conquered side, were heartily weary of. Few or none of them were men of the sword; they had no share in the honour; they had made large fortunes, and were at the head of all affairs. But they well knew by what tenure they held their power; that the Qu[een] saw through their designs, that they had entirely lost the hearts of the clergy; that the landed men were against them; that they were detested by the body of the people; and that nothing bore them up but their credit with the bank and other stocks, which would be neither formidable nor necessary when the war was at an

[1] "For what condition of peace is that in which nothing is conceded him with whom you are making peace?" [T. S.]

end. For these reasons they resolved to disappoint all overtures of a peace, till they and their party should be so deeply rooted as to make it impossible to shake them. To this end, they began to precipitate matters so fast, as in a little time must have ruined the constitution, if the crown had not interposed, and rather ventured the accidental effects of their malice, than such dreadful consequences of their power. And indeed, had the former danger been greater than some hoped or feared, I see no difficulty in the choice, which was the same with his, who said, "he had rather be devoured by wolves than by rats." I therefore still insist that we cannot wonder at, or find fault with the army, for concurring with a ministry who was for prolonging the war. The inclination is natural in them all, pardonable in those who have not yet made their fortunes, and as lawful in the rest, as love of power or love of money can make it. But as natural, as pardonable, and as lawful as this inclination is, when it is not under check of the civil power, or when a corrupt ministry joins in giving it too great a scope, the consequence can be nothing less than infallible ruin and slavery to a state.

After I had finished this Paper, the printer sent me two small pamphlets, called "The Management of the War,"[1] written with some plausibility, much artifice, and abundance of misrepresentation, as well as direct falsehoods in point of fact. These I have thought worth *Examining*, which I shall accordingly do when I find an opportunity.

[1] The two pamphlets referred to were both written by Dr. Francis Hare, chaplain-general to the Duke of Marlborough, and afterwards Bishop of Chichester. The first was dated November 23rd, 1710, and was entitled, "The Management of the War. In a Letter to a Tory-Member." The second was called, "The Management of the War. In a Second Letter to a Tory-Member," and was dated November 30th, 1710. The pamphlets are again referred to in the twenty-ninth number of "The Examiner," where the writer states that on second thoughts he has decided to deal with them "in a discourse by itself." This he did. See note on p. 184. [T. S.]

NUMB. 25.[1]

FROM THURSDAY JANUARY 11, TO THURSDAY JANUARY 18. 1710.[2]

Parva momenta in spem metumque impellunt animos.[3]

HOPES are natural to most men, especially to sanguine complexions, and among the various changes that happen in the course of public affairs, they are seldom without some grounds: Even in desperate cases, where it is impossible they should have any foundation, they are often affected, to keep a countenance, and make an enemy think we have some resource which they know nothing of. This appears to have been for some months past the condition of those people, whom I am forced, for want of other phrases, to called the *ruined party*. They have taken up since their fall, some real, and some pretended hopes. When the E. of S[underlan]d was discarded, they *hoped* her M[ajesty] would proceed no farther in the change of her ministry, and had the insolence to misrepresent her words to foreign states. They *hoped*, nobody durst advise the dissolution of the Parliament. When this was done, and further alterations made at Court, they *hoped* and endeavoured to ruin the credit of the nation. They likewise *hoped* that we should have some terrible loss abroad, which would force us to unravel all, and begin again upon their bottom. But, of all their *hopes*, whether real or assumed, there is none more extraordinary than that which they now would seem to place their whole confidence in: that this great turn of affairs was only occasioned by a short madness of the people, from

[1] No. 24 in the reprint. [T. S.]
[2] *I.e.* 1710-11. [T. S.]
[3] "The merest trifles affect our spirits, and fill us with hope or fear." [T. S.]

which they will recover in a little time, when their eyes are open, and they grow cool and sober enough to consider the truth of things, and how much they have been deceived. It is not improbable, that some few of the deepest sighted among these reasoners, are well enough convinced how vain all such *hopes* must be: but for the rest, the wisest of them seem to have been very ill judges of the people's dispositions, the want of which knowledge was a principal occasion to hasten their ruin; for surely had they suspected which way the popular current inclined, they never would have run against it by that impeachment. I therefore conclude, they generally are so blind, as to imagine some comfort from this fantastical opinion, that the people of England are at present distracted, but will shortly come to their senses again.

For the service therefore of our adversaries and friends, I shall briefly *examine* this point, by shewing what are the causes and symptoms of a people's madness, and how it differs from their natural bent and inclination.

It is Machiavel's observation, that the people when left to their own judgment, do seldom mistake their true interests; and indeed they naturally love the constitution they are born under, never desiring to change but under great oppressions. However, they are to be deceived by several means. It has often happened in Greece, and sometimes in Rome, that those very men who have contributed to shake off a former tyranny, have, instead of restoring the old constitution, deluded the People into a worse and more ignominious slavery. Besides, all great changes have the same effect upon commonwealths that thunder has upon liquors, making the dregs fly up to the top: the lowest plebeians rise to the head of affairs, and there preserve themselves by representing the nobles and other friends to the old government, as enemies to the public. The encouraging of new mysteries and new deities, with the pretences of further purity in religion, hath likewise been a frequent topic to mislead the people. And, not to mention more, the promoting false reports of dangers from abroad, hath often served to prevent them from fencing against real dangers at home. By these and the like arts, in conjunction with a great depravity of manners, and a weak or corrupt administration, the madness of the people hath risen to such a

height as to break in pieces the whole frame of the best instituted governments. But however, such great frenzies being artificially raised, are a perfect force and constraint upon human nature, and under a wise steady prince, will certainly decline of themselves, settling like the sea after a storm, and then the true bent and genius of the people will appear. Ancient and modern story are full of instances to illustrate what I say. In our own island we had a great example of a long madness in the people, kept up by a thousand artifices like intoxicating medicines, till the constitution was destroyed; yet the malignity being spent, and the humour exhausted that served to foment it; before the usurpers could fix upon a new scheme, the people suddenly recovered, and peaceably restored the old constitution.

From what I have offered, it will be easy to decide, whether this late change in the dispositions of the people were a new madness, or a recovery from an old one. Neither do I see how it can be proved that such a change had in any circumstance the least symptoms of madness, whether my description of it be right or no. It is agreed, that the truest way of judging the dispositions of the people in the choice of their representatives, is by computing the county-elections; and in these, it is manifest that five in six are entirely for the present measures; although the court was so far from interposing its credit, that there was no change in the admiralty, not above one or two in the lieutenancy, nor any other methods used to influence elections.[1] The free unextorted addresses[2] sent some time before from every part of the kingdom, plainly shewed what sort of bent the people had taken, and from what motives. The election of members for this great city,[3] carried contrary to

[1] See Swift's "Memoirs Relating to that Change," etc., vol. v., p. 386 of present edition. [T. S.]

[2] "The general ferment soon after [1710, summer] broke out into numerous addresses, of very different style and tenor, that were presented to the Queen. . . . The high-church addresses not only exceeded the others in number, but were also far better received; as complimenting the Queen with a more extensive prerogative, and an hereditary title" (Chamberlen's "History of Queen Anne," p. 347). [T. S.]

[3] At the general election in October and November, 1710, the City of London returned four Tories: Sir Wm. Withers, Sir R. Hoare, Sir G. Newland, and Mr. John Cass. [T. S.

all conjecture, against the united interest of those two great bodies, the Bank and East India Company, was another convincing argument. Besides, the Whigs themselves have always confessed, that the bulk of landed men in England was generally of Tories. So that this change must be allowed to be according to the natural genius and disposition of the people, whether it were just and reasonable in itself or not.

Notwithstanding all which, you shall frequently hear the partisans of the late men in power, gravely and decisively pronounce, that the present ministry cannot possibly stand.[1] Now, they who affirm this, if they believe themselves, must ground their opinion, upon the iniquity of the *last* being so far established, and deeply rooted, that no endeavours of honest men, will be able to restore things to their former state. Or else these reasoners have been so misled by twenty years' mismanagement, that they have forgot our constitution, and talk as if our monarchy and revolution began together. But the body of the people is wiser, and by the choice they have made, shew they *do* understand our constitution, and would bring it back to the old form; which if the new ministers take care to maintain, they will and ought to stand, otherwise they may fall like their predecessors. But I think we may easily foresee what a Parliament freely chosen, without threatening or corruption, is likely to do, when no man shall be in any danger to lose his place by the freedom of his voice.

But, who are those advancers of this opinion, that the present ministry cannot hold? It must be either such as are afraid to be called to an account, in case it should hold; or those who keep offices, from which others, better qualified, were removed; and may reasonably apprehend to be turned out, for worthier men to come in their places, since perhaps it will be necessary to make some changes, that the public business of the nation may go on: or lastly, stock-jobbers, who industriously spread such reports that actions may fall, and their friends buy to advantage.

Yet these hopes, thus freely expressed, as they are more sincere, so they are more supportable, than when they appear under the disguise and pretence of fears. Some of

[1] Harley's ministry continued in power until July, 1714. [T. S.]

these gentlemen are employed to shake their heads in proper companies; to doubt where all this will end; to be in mighty pain for the nation; to shew how impossible it is, that the public credit can be supported: to pray that all may do well in whatever hands; but very much to doubt that the Pretender is at the bottom. I know not any thing so nearly resembling this behaviour, as what I have often seen among the friends of a sick man, whose interest it is that he should die: The physicians protest they see no danger; the symptoms are good, the medicines answer expectation; yet still they are not to be comforted; they whisper, he is a gone man; it is not possible he should hold out; he has perfect death in his face; they never liked this doctor: At last the patient recovers, and their joy is as false as their grief.

I believe there is no man so sanguine, who did not apprehend some ill consequences from the late change, though not in any proportion to the good ones: but it is manifest, the former have proved much fewer and lighter than were expected, either at home or abroad, by the fears of our friends, or the hopes of our enemies. Those remedies that stir the humours in a diseased body, are at first more painful than the malady itself; yet certain death is the consequence of deferring them too long. Actions have fallen, and the loans are said to come in slowly. But beside, that something of this must have been, whether there had been any change or no; beside, that the surprise of every change, for the better as well as the worse, is apt to affect credit for a while; there is a further reason, which is plain and scandalous. When the late party was at the helm, those who were called the Tories, never put their resentments in balance with the safety of the nation, but cheerfully contributed to the common cause. Now the scene is changed, the fallen party seems to act from very different motives: they have *given the word about;* they will keep their money and be passive; and in this point stand upon the same foot with Papists and Nonjurors. What would have become of the public, if the present great majority had acted thus, during the late administration? Had acted thus, before the others were masters of that wealth they have squeezed out of the landed men, and with the strength of that, would now hold the kingdom at defiance?

Thus much I have thought fit to say, without pointing reflections upon any particular person; which I have hitherto but sparingly done, and that only towards those whose characters are too profligate, that the managing of them should be of any consequence: Besides as it is a talent I am not naturally fond of, so, in the subjects I treat, it is generally needless. If I display the effects of avarice and ambition, of bribery and corruption, of gross immorality and irreligion, those who are the least conversant in things, will easily know where to apply them. Not that I lay any weight upon the objections of such who charge me with this proceeding: it is notorious enough that the writers of the other side were the first aggressors. Not to mention their scurrilous libels many years ago, directly levelled at particular persons; how many papers do now come out every week, full of rude invectives against the present ministry, with the first and last letters of their names to prevent mistakes? It is good sometimes to let these people see, that we neither want spirit nor materials to retaliate; and therefore in this point *alone*, I shall follow their example, whenever I find myself sufficiently provoked; only with one addition, that whatever charges I bring, either general or particular, shall be religiously true, either upon avowed facts which none can deny, or such as I can prove from my own knowledge.

Being resolved publicly to acknowledge any mistakes I have been guilty of; I do here humbly desire the reader's pardon for one of mighty importance, about a fact in one of my papers, said to be done in the cathedral of Gloucester.[1] A whole Hydra of errors in two words: For as I am since informed, it was neither in the cathedral, nor city, nor county of Gloucester, but some other church of that diocese. If I had ever met any other objection of equal weight, though from the meanest hands, I should certainly have answered it.

[1] This act of Wharton's was alluded to by the Duke of Leeds in the House of Lords on December 6th, 1705. See Dartmouth's note on Burnet's "Own Times," vol. ii., p. 435, and compare "History of Parliament," and "Journals of House of Lords." When the Duke of Leeds insinuated pretty plainly to Wharton the nature of his offence, Dartmouth remarks that the "Lord Wharton was very silent for the rest of that day, and desired no further explanations." [T. S.]

NUMB. 26.[1]

FROM THURSDAY JANUARY 18, TO THURSDAY JANUARY 25. 1710-11.

Διαλεξάμενοί τινα ἠσυχῇ, τὸ μὲν σῦμπαν ἐπί τε τῇ δυναστείᾳ καὶ κατὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν συνώμοσαν.

Summissa quaedam voce collocuti sunt; quorum summa erat de dominatione sibi confirmanda, ac inimicis delendis conjuratio.[2]

NOT many days ago I observed a knot of discontented gentlemen cursing the Tories to Hell for their uncharitableness, in affirming, that if the late ministry had continued to this time, we should have had neither Church nor Monarchy left. They are usually so candid as to call that the opinion of a party, which they hear in a coffee-house, or over a bottle from some warm young people, whom it is odds but they have provoked to say more than they believed, by some positions as absurd and ridiculous of their own. And so it proved in this very instance: for, asking one of these gentlemen, what it was that provoked those he had been disputing with, to advance such a paradox? he assured me in a very calm manner, it was nothing in the world, but that himself and some others of the company had made it appear, that the design of the present P[arliamen]t and m[inistr]y, was to bring in Popery, arbitrary power, and the Pretender: which I take to be an opinion fifty times more improbable, as well as more uncharitable, than what is charged upon the Whigs: because I defy our adversaries to produce one single reason for suspecting such designs in the persons now at the helm;

[1] No. 25 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] "They met and whispered together; and their entire aim was the confirmation of their own power and an oath for the destruction of their enemies." [T. S.]

whereas I can upon demand produce twenty to shew, that some late men had strong views towards a commonwealth, and the alteration of the Church.

It is natural indeed, when a storm is over, that has only untiled our houses, and blown down some of our chimneys, to consider what further mischiefs might have ensued, if it had lasted longer. However, in the present case, I am not of the opinion above-mentioned; I believe the Church and State might have lasted somewhat longer, though the late enemies to both had done their worst: I can hardly conceive how things would have been so soon ripe for a new revolution. I am convinced, that if they had offered to make such large and sudden strides, it must have come to blows, and according to the computation we have now reason to think a right one, I can partly guess what would have been the issue. Besides, we are sure the Q[uee]n would have interposed before they came to extremities, and as little as they regarded the regal authority, would have been a check in their career.

But instead of this question; What would have been the consequence if the late ministry had continued? I will propose another, which will be more useful for us to consider; and that is, What we may reasonably expect they will do, if ever they come into power again? This, we know, is the design and endeavour of all those scribbles that daily fly about in their favour; of all the false, insolent, and scandalous libels against the present administration; and of all those engines set at work to sink the actions, and blow up the public credit. As for those who shew their inclinations by writing, there is one consideration, which I wonder does not sometimes affect them: for how can they forbear having a good opinion of the gentleness and innocence of those, who permit them to employ their pens as they do? It puts me in mind of an insolent pragmatical orator somewhere in Greece, who railing with great freedom at the chief men in the state, was answered by one who had been very instrumental in recovering the liberty of the city, that "he thanked the gods they had now arrived to the condition he always wished them, when every man in that city might securely say what they pleased." I wish these gentlemen would however compare the liberty they take with what

their masters used to give: how many messengers and warrants would have gone out against any that durst have opened their lips, or drawn their pens, against the persons and proceedings of their juntoes and cabals? How would their weekly writers have been calling out for prosecution and punishment? We remember when a poor nickname,[1] borrowed from an old play of Ben Jonson, and mentioned in a sermon without any particular application, was made use of as a motive to spur an impeachment. But after all, it must be confessed, they had reasons to be thus severe, which their successors have not: *their* faults would never endure the light; and to have exposed them sooner, would have raised the kingdom against the actors, before the time.

But, to come to the subject I have now undertaken; which is to *examine*, what the consequences would be, upon supposition that the Whigs were now restored to their power. I already imagine the present free P[arliamen]t dissolved, and another of a different epithet met, by the force of money and management. I read immediately a dozen or two stinging votes against the proceedings of the late ministry. The bill now to be repealed would then be re-enacted, and the birthright of an Englishman reduced again to the value of twelvepence.[2] But to give the reader a stronger imagination of such a scene; let me represent the designs of some men, lately endeavoured and projected, in the form of a paper of votes.

"Ordered, That a Bill be brought in for repealing the Sacramental Test.

[1] The following is the passage in Sacheverell's sermon in which the nickname is used: "What dependence can there be upon a man of no principles? . . . In what moving and lively colours does the holy Psalmist paint out the crafty insidiousness of such wily Volpones!" Godolphin, in spite of Somers's protest against such action, brought about the preacher's impeachment, for this description of himself, as he took it. See also vol. v., p. 219 and note of present edition. [T. S.]

[2] An attempt was made to repeal the Act for Naturalizing Foreign Protestants (7 Ann. c. 5), which received the royal assent, March 23rd, 170$\frac{8}{9}$, by a Bill which passed the House of Commons, January 31st, 171$\frac{0}{1}$, but was thrown out by the Lords, February 5th. Persons naturalized under this Act had to pay a fee of one shilling on taking the prescribed oath of allegiance. [T. S.]

"A petition of T[in]d[a]l, C[o]ll[in]s, Cl[en]d[o]n, C[o]w[ar]d, T[o]l[a]nd,[1] in behalf of themselves and many hundreds of their disciples, some of which are Members of this honourable H[ouse], desiring that leave be given to bring in a Bill, for qualifying Atheists, Deists and Socinians, to serve their Country in any employment.

"Ordered, That leave be given to bring in a Bill, according to the prayer of the said petition, and that Mr. L[ec]h-[me]re[2] do prepare and bring it in.

"Ordered, That a Bill be brought in for removing the education of youth out of the hands of the Clergy.

"Another, to forbid the Clergy preaching certain duties in religion, especially obedience to Princes.

"Another, to take away the jurisdiction of Bishops.

"Another, for constituting a General for life; with instructions to the committee, that care may be taken to make the war last as long as the life of the said General.

"A Bill of Attainder against C[harles] D[uke] of Sh[rewsbury], J[ohn] D[uke] of B[uckingham], L[aurence] E[arl] of R[ochester], Sir S[imon] H[arcourt], k[nigh]t, R[obert] H[arley], H[enry] S[t. John],[3] Esqs; A[bigail] M[asham], spinster,[4] and others, for high treason against the j[u]nto.

"Resolved, That S[ara]h D[uchess] of M[arlborough] hath been a most dutiful, just, and grateful servant to Her M[ajest]y.

"Resolved, That to advise the dissolution of a W[hi]g

[1] See Nos. 20 and 23, *ante*, and notes pp. 118 and 141. [T. S.]

[2] Nicholas Lechmere (1675-1727), member for Appleby (1708-10), Cockermouth (1710-17), and Tewkesbury (1717-21), was one of the managers in the impeachment of Sacheverell. He, with Addison, Hoadly, and Minshull corrected Steele's draft of "The Crisis" for publication. He was created Lord Lechmere in 1721, after he had held the offices of solicitor-general (1714-18) and attorney-general (1718-20). See also vol. v., p. 326 note, of present edition. [T. S.]

[3] "R. H. H. S. Esqs;" in both editions. In Faulkner's collected reprint the second name was altered to William Shippen, and Scott follows Faulkner; but there can be no doubt that the initials were intended for St. John, since the persons named were those who succeeded to the places of the dismissed ministers. Shippen was a prominent member of the October Club, but he did not hold any public office. [T. S.]

[4] In No. 19 of "The Medley," the writer calls "The Examiner" to account for writing Abigail Masham, *spinster*. She was then Mrs. Masham. [T. S.]

Parliament, or the removal of a W[hi]g Ministry, was in order to bring in Popery and the Pretender; and that the said advice was high treason.

"Resolved, That by the original compact the Government of this Realm is by a junto, and a K[ing] or Qu[een]; but the Administration solely in the junto.

"Ordered, That a Bill be brought in for further limiting the Prerogative.

"Ordered, That it be a standing order of this H[ouse] that the merit of elections be not determined by the number of voices, or right of electors, but by weight; and that one Whig shall weigh down ten Tories.

"A motion being made, and the question being put, that when a Whig is detected of manifest bribery, and his competitor being a Tory, has ten to one a majority, there shall be a new election; it passed in the negative.

"Resolved, That for a K[ing] or Q[ueen] of this Realm, to read or examine a paper brought them to be signed by a j[un]to Minister, is arbitrary and illegal, and a violation of the liberties of the people."

These and the like reformations would, in all probability, be the first fruits of the Whigs' resurrection; and what structures such able artists might in a short time build upon such foundations, I leave others to conjecture. All hopes of a peace cut off; the nation industriously involved in further debts to a degree, that none would dare undertake the management of affairs, but those whose interest lay in ruining the constitution. I do not see how the wisest prince under such necessities could be able to extricate himself. Then, as to the Church, the bishops would by degrees be dismissed, first from the Parliament, next from their revenues, and at last from their office; and the clergy, instead of their idle claim of independency on the state, would be forced to depend for their daily bread on every individual. But what system of future government was designed; whether it were already digested, or would have been left for time and incidents to mature, I shall not now *Examine*. Only upon this occasion I cannot help reflecting on a fact, which it is probable, the reader knows as well as myself. There was a picture drawn some time ago, repre-

senting five persons as large as the life, sitting at council together like a Pentarchy. A void space was left for a sixth, which was to have been the Qu[een], to whom they intended that honour: but her M[ajest]y having since fallen under their displeasure, they have made a shift to crowd in two better friends in her place, which makes it a complete Heptarchy.[1] This piece is now in the country, reserved till better times, and hangs in a hall, among the pictures of Cromwell, Bradshaw, Ireton, and some other predecessors.

I must now desire leave to say something to a gentleman, who has been pleased to publish a discourse against a paper of mine relating to the convocation.[2] He promises to set me right, without any undue reflections or undecent language. I suppose he means in comparison with others, who pretend to answer the "Examiner": So far he is right; but if he thinks he has behaved himself as becomes a candid antagonist, I believe he is mistaken. He says, in his title-page, my "representations are unfair, and my reflections unjust." And his conclusion is yet more severe,[3] where he "doubts I and my friends are enraged against the Dutch, because they preserved us from Popery and arbitrary power at the Revolution; and since that time, from being overrun by the exorbitant power of France, and becoming a prey to the Pretender." Because this author seems in general to write with an honest meaning, I would seriously put to him the question, whether he thinks I and my friends are for Popery, arbitrary power, France and the Pretender? I omit other instances of smaller moment, which however do not suit in my opinion with due reflection or decent

[1] See No. 23, *ante*, and notes p. 138. [T. S.]

[2] "The Case of the Present Convocation Consider'd; In Answer to the Examiner's Unfair Representation of it, and Unjust Reflections upon it." 1711. See note p. 129. [T. S.]

[3] "They [the Dutch] have a right to put us in mind, that without their assistance in 1688, Popery and arbitrary power must, without a miracle, have over-run us; and that even since that time, we must have sunk under the exorbitant power of France, and our Church and Queen must have been a prey to a Pretender imposed upon us by this exorbitant power, if that tottering commonwealth . . . had not heartily joined with us. . . . But I forget my self, and I doubt, allege those very things in their favour, for which the 'Examiner' and his friends, are the most enraged against them" ("The Case," etc., p. 24). [T. S.]

language. The fact relating to the convocation, came from a good hand, and I do not find this author differs from me in any material circumstance about it. My reflections were no more than what might be obvious to any other gentleman, who had heard of their late proceedings. If the notion be right which this author gives us of a Lower House of Convocation, it is a very melancholy one,[1] and to me seems utterly inconsistent with that of a body of men whom he owns to have a negative; and therefore, since a great majority of the clergy differs from him in several points he advances, I shall rather choose to be of their opinion than his. I fancy, when the whole synod met in one house, as this writer affirms, they were upon a better foot with their bishops, and therefore whether this treatment so extremely *de haut en bas*, since their exclusion, be suitable to primitive custom or primitive humility towards brethren, is not my business to enquire. One may allow the divine or apostolic right of Episcopacy, and their great superiority over presbyters, and yet dispute the methods of exercising the latter, which being of human institution, are subject to encroachments and usurpations. I know, every clergyman in a diocese has a good deal of dependence upon his bishop, and owes him canonical obedience: but I was apt to think, when the whole representative of the clergy met in a synod, they were considered in another light, at least since they are allowed to have a negative. If I am mistaken, I desire to be excused, as talking out of my trade: only there is one thing wherein I entirely differ from this author. Since in the disputes about privileges, one side must recede; where so very few privileges remain, it is a hundred to one odds, the encroachments are not on the inferior clergy's side; and no man can blame them for insisting on the small number that is left. There is one fact wherein I must take occasion to set this author right; that the person who first moved the QUEEN to remit the first-fruits and tenths to the clergy,

[1] They [*i.e.* the bishops] say that the prolocutor is "the referendary of the lower house, *i.e.* one who is to carry messages and admonitions from the upper house to the lower, and to represent their sense, and to carry their petitions to the upper: That originally the synod met all in one house in this, as it still does in the other province" ("The Case," etc., p. 14). [T. S.]

was an eminent instrument in the late turn of affairs;[1] and as I am told, has lately prevailed to have the same favour granted for the clergy of Ireland.[2]

But I must beg leave to inform the author, that this paper is not intended for the management of controversy, which would be of very little import to most readers, and only misspend time, that I would gladly employ to better purposes. For where it is a man's business to entertain a whole room-full, it is unmannerly to apply himself to a particular person, and turn his back upon the rest of the company.

[1] Bishop Burnet had made a similar proposal to Queen Mary several years before, "so that she was fully resolved, if ever she had lived to see peace and settlement, . . . to have applied it to the augmentation of small benefices." He had also laid it very fully before the Princess of Denmark in the reign of King William ("Hist. Own Times," ii. 370).

"This very project . . . was first set on foot by a great minister in the last reign. It was then far advanced, and would have been finished, had he stayed but a few months longer in the ministry" ("The Case," etc., p. 23). [T. S.]

[2] Swift's own Memorial to Harley, petitioning the Queen to surrender the first-fruits in Ireland is given in Scott's edition (vol. xv., pp. 381-4). It was on behalf of these first-fruits that Swift came to England, in 1707, on a commission from Archbishop King. Then he made his application as a Whig to a Whig government, but failing with Somers and Halifax both in this and in his hopes for advancement, he joined Harley's fortunes. [T. S.]

NUMB. 27.[1]

FROM THURSDAY JANUARY 25, TO THURSDAY FEBRUARY 1. 1710-11.[2]

Ea autem est gloria, laus recte factorum, magnorumque in rempublicam meritorum: Quae cum optimi cujusque, tum etiam multitudinis testimonio comprobatur.[3]

I AM thinking, what a mighty advantage it is to be entertained as a writer to a ruined cause. I remember a fanatic preacher, who was inclined to come into the Church, and take orders; but upon mature thoughts was diverted from that design, when he considered that the collections of the *godly* were a much heartier and readier penny, than he could get by wrangling for tithes. He certainly had reason, and the two cases are parallel. If you write in defence of a fallen party, you are maintained by contribution as a necessary person, you have little more to do than to carp and cavil at those who hold the pen on the other side; you are sure to be celebrated and caressed by all your party, to a man. You may affirm and deny what you please, without truth or probability, since it is but loss of time to contradict you. Besides, commiseration is often on your side, and you have a pretence to be thought honest and disinterested, for adhering to friends in distress. After which, if your party ever happens to turn up again, you have a strong fund of

[1] No. 26 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Writing to Stella, under date February 3rd, 171½, Swift says: "They are plaguy Whigs, especially the sister Armstrong [Mrs. Armstrong, Lady Lucy's sister], the most insupportable of all women pretending to wit, without any taste. She was running down the last 'Examiner,' the prettiest I had read, with a character of the present ministry" (vol. ii., p. 112 of present edition.) [T. S.]

[3] "For that is true glory and praise for noble deeds that deserve well of the state, when they not only win the approval of the best men but also that of the multitude." [T. S.]

merit towards making your fortune. Then, you never fail to be well furnished with materials, every one bringing in his *quota*, and falsehood being naturally more plentiful than truth. Not to mention the wonderful delight of libelling men in power, and hugging yourself in a corner with mighty satisfaction for what you have done.

It is quite otherwise with us, who engage as volunteers in the service of a flourishing ministry, in full credit with the Q[uee]n, and beloved by the people, because they have no sinister ends or dangerous designs, but pursue with steadiness and resolution the true interests of both. Upon which account they little want or desire our assistance; and we may write till the world is weary of reading, without having our pretences allowed either to a place or a pension: besides, we are refused the common benefit of the party, to have our works cried up of course; the readers of our own side being as ungentle and hard to please, as if we writ against them; and our papers never make their way in the world, but barely in proportion to their merit. The design of *their* labours who write on the conquered side, is likewise of greater importance than ours; they are like cordials for dying men, which must be repeated; whereas ours are, in the Scripture phrase, but "meat for babes": at least, all I can pretend, is to undeceive the ignorant and those at distance; but their task is to keep up the sinking spirits of a whole party.

After such reflections, I cannot be angry with those gentlemen for perpetually writing against me: it furnishes them largely with topics, and is besides, their proper business: neither is it affectation, or altogether scorn, that I do not reply. But as things are, we both act suitable to our several provinces: mine is, by laying open some corruptions in the late management, to set those who are ignorant, right in their opinions of persons and things: it is theirs to cover with fig-leaves all the faults of their friends, as well as they can: When I have produced my facts, and offered my arguments, I have nothing farther to advance; it is their office to deny and disprove; and then let the world decide. If I were as they, my chief endeavour should certainly be to batter down the "Examiner," therefore I cannot but approve their design. Besides, they have indeed another reason for

barking incessantly at this paper: they have in their prints openly taxed a most ingenious person as author of it;[1] one who is in great and very deserved reputation with the world, both on account of his poetical works, and his talents for public business. They were wise enough to consider, what a sanction it would give their performances, to fall under the animadversion of such a pen; and have therefore used all the forms of provocation commonly practised by little obscure pedants, who are fond of distinguishing themselves by the fame of an adversary. So nice a taste have these judicious critics, in pretending to discover an author by his style and manner of thinking: not to mention the justice and candour of exhausting all the stale topics of scurrility in reviling a paper, and then flinging at a venture the whole load upon one who is entirely innocent; and whose greatest fault, perhaps, is too much gentleness toward a party, from whose leaders he has received quite contrary treatment.

The concern I have for the ease and reputation of so deserving a gentleman, hath at length forced me, much against my interest and inclination, to let these angry people know who is *not* the author of the "Examiner."[2] For, I observed, the opinion began to spread, and I chose rather to sacrifice the honour I received by it, than let injudicious people entitle him to a performance, that perhaps he might have reason to be ashamed of: still faithfully promising, never to disturb those worthy advocates; but suffer them in quiet to roar on at the "Examiner," if they or their party find any ease in it; as physicians say there is, to people in torment, such as men in the gout, or women in labour.

However, I must acknowledge myself indebted to them for one hint, which I shall now pursue, though in a different manner. Since the fall of the late ministry, I have seen many papers filled with their encomiums; I conceive, in imitation of those who write the lives of famous men, where,

[1] It was reported that the author of "The Examiner" was Matthew Prior, late under-secretary of state. [T. S.]

[2] To Stella Swift wrote in his "Journal," under date February 9th: —"The account you give of that weekly paper [*i.e.* 'The Examiner,'] agrees with us here. Mr. Prior was like to be insulted in the street for being supposed the author of it, but one of the last papers cleared him. Nobody knows who it is, but those few in the secret. I suppose the ministry and the printer" (vol. ii., p. 116 of present edition).

after their deaths, immediately follow their characters. When I saw the poor virtues thus dealt at random, I thought the disposers had flung their names, like valentines into a hat, to be drawn as fortune pleased, by the j[u]nto and their friends. There, Crassus [1] drew liberty and gratitude; Fulvia,[2] humility and gentleness; Clodius,[3] piety and justice; Gracchus,[4] loyalty to his prince; Cinna,[5] love of his country and constitution; and so of the rest. Or, to quit this allegory, I have often seen of late, the whole set of discarded statesmen, celebrated by their judicious hirelings, for those very qualities which their admirers owned they chiefly wanted. Did these heroes put off and lock up their virtues when they came into employment, and have they now resumed them since their dismissions? If they wore them, I am sure it was *under* their greatness, and without ever once convincing the world of their visibility or influence.

But why should not the present ministry find a pen to praise them as well as the last? This is what I shall now undertake, and it may be more impartial in me, from whom they have deserved so little. I have, *without being called*, served them half a year in quality of champion,[6] and by help of the Qu[een] and a majority of nine in ten of the kingdom, have been able to protect them against a routed cabal of hated politicians, with a dozen of scribblers at their head: yet so far have they been from rewarding me suitable to my deserts, that to this day they never so much as sent to the printer to enquire who I was; though I have known a time and a ministry, where a person of half my merit and consideration would have had fifty promises, and in the mean time a pension settled on him, whereof the *first quarter* should be honestly paid. Therefore my resentments shall so far prevail, that in praising those who are now at the head of affairs, I shall at the same time take notice of their defects.

[1] The Duke of Marlborough. See "The Examiner," No. 28, p. 177. [T. S.]

[2] The Duchess of Marlborough. [T. S.]

[3] Earl of Wharton, notorious for his profligacy. [T. S.]

[4] This may refer to Godolphin. [T. S.]

[5] Probably Earl Cowper. [T. S.]

[6] This applies to the paper. "The Examiner" had existed for six months, but Swift had written it for only three months, at this time. [T. S.]

Was any man more eminent in his profession than the present l[or]d k[eepe]r,[1] or more distinguished by his eloquence and great abilities in the House of Commons? And will not his enemies allow him to be fully equal to the great station he now adorns? But then it must be granted, that he is wholly ignorant in the speculative as well as practical part of polygamy: he knows not how to metamorphose a sober man into a lunatic:[2] he is no freethinker in religion, nor has courage to be patron of an atheistical book,[3] while he is guardian of the Qu[een]'s conscience. Though after all, to speak my private opinion, I cannot think these such mighty objections to his character, as some would pretend.

The person who now presides at the council,[4] is descended from a great and honourable father, not from the dregs of the people; he was at the head of the treasury for some years, and rather chose to enrich his prince than himself. In the height of favour and credit, he sacrificed the greatest employment in the kingdom to his conscience and honour: he has been always firm in his loyalty and religion, zealous

[1] Sir Simon Harcourt (1661?-1727) who was lord chancellor, 1713-14. He was made lord keeper, October 19th, 1710, after Cowper resigned the chancellorship. In the Sacheverell trial Harcourt was the doctor's counsel. He was created Baron Harcourt in 1711. See also note on p. 213 of vol. v. of present edition. [T. S.]

[2] This refers to the case of Richard, fifth Viscount Wenman, against whom Cowper, in 1709, granted a commission of lunacy. He was under the care of Francis Wroughton, Esq., whose sister, Susannah, he had married in the early part of 1709. His brother-in-law sued him for payment of his sister's portion, and asked that trustees be appointed for his estate. Cowper decided against Wenman, and the commission granted.

The case is referred to in No. 40 of "The Tatler" (July 12th, 1709). Campbell says ("Chancellors," iv. 330) the commission "very properly issued." Luttrell in his "Diary" (July 30th, 1709) notes that "the jury yesterday brought it in that he [Wenman] was no idiot" (vi. 470). Lord Wenman died November 28th, 1729. See also Nos. 18 and 23, *ante*, and note, p. 101. [T. S.]

[3] Tindal dedicated to Cowper "a pious work which was not altogether orthodox" (Campbell's "Chancellors," iv. 330). [T. S.]

[4] Laurence Hyde (1641-1711), created Earl of Rochester in 1682, was appointed lord president of the council, September 21st, 1710, succeeding Somers. See also No. 41, *post*. Swift unkindly sneers at Somers's low birth. See note on Somers on p. 29 of vol. i. of present edition. [T. S.]

for supporting the prerogative of the crown, and preserving the liberties of the people. But then, his best friends must own that he is neither Deist nor Socinian: he has never conversed with T[o]l[a]nd, to open and enlarge his thoughts, and dispel the prejudices of education; nor was he ever able to arrive at that perfection of gallantry, to ruin and imprison the husband, in order to keep the wife without disturbance.[1]

The present l[or]d st[ewa]rd[2] has been always distinguished for his wit and knowledge; is of consummate wisdom and experience in affairs; has continued constant to the true interest of the nation, which he espoused from the beginning, and is every way qualified to support the dignity of his office: but in point of oratory must give place to his predecessor.[3]

The D. of Sh[rewsbur]y[4] was highly instrumental in bringing about the Revolution, in which service he freely exposed his life and fortune. He has ever been the favourite

[1] Mrs. Manley, in her "Memoirs of Europe towards the Close of the Eighth Century," has something very characteristic to say on this subject. Speaking of Somers under the name Cicero, she says: "Cicero, Madam, is by birth a plebeian" . . . "Cicero himself, an oracle of wisdom, was whirled about by his lusts, at the pleasure of a fantastic worn-out mistress. He prostituted his inimitable sense, reason, and good nature, either to revenge, or reward, as her caprice directed; and what made this commerce more detestable, this mistress of his was a wife!" . . . "that she was the wife of an injured friend! a friend who passionately loved her, and had tenderly obliged him, rather heightened his desires" (i., 200; ii., 54, 83). The mistress is said to be Mrs. Blunt, daughter of Sir R. Fanshaw. [T. S.]

[2] John Sheffield (1647-1721), third Earl of Mulgrave, was created Marquess of Normanby, 1694, and Duke of Buckingham and Normanby in 170$\frac{3}{4}$. He succeeded the Duke of Devonshire as lord steward of the household on September 21st, 1710. He was the author of a poetical "Essay on Poetry," and an interesting prose "Account of the Revolution." As patron to Dryden he received the dedication of that poet's "Aurengzebe." Pope edited his collected works in 1722-23. [T. S.]

[3] William Cavendish (1673?-1729) succeeded his father as second Duke of Devonshire in 1707. He was lord steward, 1707-10, and lord president, 1716-17.

[4] Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury, is styled by Swift elsewhere (Letter to Archbishop King, October 20th, 1713; Scott's edition, xvi. 71), "the finest gentleman we have" (see note on p. 377 of vol. v. of present edition). He was lord chamberlain, 1710-14. [T. S.]

of the nation, being possessed of all the amiable qualities that can accomplish a great man; but in the agreeableness and fragrancy of his person, and the profoundness of his politics, must be allowed to fall very short of ——.[1]

Mr. H[arley] had the honour of being chosen Speaker successively to three Parliaments;[2] he was the first of late years, that ventured to restore the forgotten custom of treating his PRINCE with duty and respect. Easy and disengaged in private conversation, with such a weight of affairs upon his shoulders;[3] of great learning, and as great a favourer and protector of it; intrepid by nature, as well as by the consciousness of his own integrity, and a despiser of money; pursuing the true interest of his PRINCE and country against all obstacles. Sagacious to view into the remotest consequences of things, by which all difficulties fly before him. A firm friend, and a placable enemy, sacrificing his justest resentments, not only to public good, but to common intercession and acknowledgment. Yet with all these virtues it must be granted, there is some mixture of human infirmity: His greatest admirers must confess his skill at cards and dice to be very low and superficial: in horse-racing he is utterly ignorant:[4] then, to save a few millions to the public, he never regards how many worthy citizens he hinders from making up their plum. And surely there is one thing never to be forgiven him, that he delights to have his table filled with black coats, whom he uses as if they were gentlemen.

[1] Henry de Grey (1664?-1740) succeeded his father as eleventh Earl of Kent in 1702. He was created Marquess of Kent, 1706, and Duke of Kent, 1710. He held the office of lord chamberlain of the household from 1704 to 1710. [T. S.]

[2] Harley was first chosen Speaker, February 10th, 170⅘, for a Parliament that lasted nine months; then again, December 30th, 1701, for a Parliament that lasted only six months; and finally October 20th or 21st, 1702. [T. S.]

[3] "The Queen dismissed the Earl of Godolphin from being lord treasurer, and put the treasury in commission: Lord Powlet was the first in form, but Mr. Harley was the person with whom the secret was lodged" (Burnet, "Own Times," ii. 552-3). He was appointed August 10th, 1710. [T. S.]

[4] Godolphin was very devoted to the turf. See Swift's poem entitled, "The Virtues of Sid Hamet's Rod" (Aldine edition, iii. 10). [T. S.]

My Lord D[artmouth][1] is a man of letters, full of good sense, good nature and honour, of strict virtue and regularity in life; but labours under one great defect, that he treats his clerks with more civility and good manners, than others, in his station, have done the Qu[een].[2]

Omitting some others, I will close this character of the present ministry, with that of Mr. S[t. John],[3] who from his youth applying those admirable talents of nature and improvements of art to public business, grew eminent in court and Parliament at an age when the generality of mankind is employed in trifles and folly. It is to be lamented, that he has not yet procured himself a busy, important countenance, nor learned that profound part of wisdom, to be difficult of access. Besides, he has clearly mistaken the true use of books, which he has thumbed and spoiled with reading, when he ought to have multiplied them on his shelves:[4] not like a great man of my acquaintance, who knew a book by the back, better than a friend by the face, though he had never conversed with the former, and often with the latter.

[1] William Legge (1672-1750) succeeded his father as second Lord Dartmouth in 1691, and was created Earl of Dartmouth in 1711. On June 14th, 1710, he was appointed secretary of state in place of the Earl of Sunderland. See note on p. 229 of vol. v. of present edition. [T. S.]

[2] The Earl of Sunderland was rude and overbearing in his manner towards the Queen. [T. S.]

[3] Henry St. John (1678-1751) was created Viscount Bolingbroke in 1712. He was secretary of war, 1704-1708, and secretary of state, 1710-14. In 1715 he was attainted and left England to enter the service of the Pretender. See also Swift's "An Enquiry," etc. (vol. v., p. 430 of present edition). [T. S.]

[4] "Those more early acquaintance of yours, your books, which a friend of ours once wittily said, 'Your L—p had mistaken the true use of, by thumbing and spoiling them with reading'" ("A Letter to the Rt. Hon. the Ld. Viscount B—ke," 1714-15). [T. S.]

NUMB. 28.[1]

FROM THURSDAY FEBRUARY 1, TO THURSDAY FEBRUARY 8. 1710-11.

Caput est in omni procuratione negotii et muneris publici, ut avaritiae pellatur etiam minima suspicio.[2]

THERE is no vice which mankind carries to such wild extremes as that of avarice: Those two which seem to rival it in this point, are lust and ambition: but, the former is checked by difficulties and diseases, destroys itself by its own pursuits, and usually declines with old age: and the latter requiring courage, conduct and fortune in a high degree, and meeting with a thousand dangers and oppositions, succeeds too seldom in an age to fall under common observation. Or, is avarice perhaps the same passion with ambition, only placed in more ignoble and dastardly minds, by which the object is changed from power to money? Or it may be, that one man pursues power in order to wealth, and another wealth in order to power; which last is the safer way, though longer about, and suiting with every period as well as condition of life, is more generally followed.

However it be, the extremes of this passion are certainly more frequent than of any other, and often to a degree so absurd and ridiculous, that if it were not for their frequency, they could hardly obtain belief. The *stage*, which carries other follies and vices beyond nature and probability, falls very short in the representations of avarice; nor are there any extravagances in this kind described by ancient or

[1] No. 27 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] "It is of the greatest importance in the discharge of every office of trade, or of the public treasury, that the least suspicion of avarice should be avoided." [T. S.]

modern comedies, which are not outdone by an hundred instances, commonly told, among ourselves.

I am ready to conclude from hence, that a vice which keeps so firm a hold upon human nature, and governs it with so unlimited a tyranny, since it cannot be wholly eradicated, ought at least to be confined to particular objects, to thrift and penury, to private fraud and extortion, and never suffered to prey upon the public; and should certainly be rejected as the most unqualifying circumstance for any employment, where bribery and corruption can possibly enter.

If the mischiefs of this vice, in a public station, were confined to enriching only those particular persons employed, the evil would be more supportable; but it is usually quite otherwise. When a steward defrauds his lord, he must connive at the rest of the servants, while they are following the same practice in their several spheres; so that in some families you may observe a subordination of knaves in a link downwards to the very helper in the stables, all cheating by concert, and with impunity: And even if this were all, perhaps the master could bear it without being undone; but it so happens, that for every shilling the servant gets by his iniquity, the master loses twenty; the perquisites of servants being but small compositions for suffering shopkeepers to bring in what bills they please.[1] It is exactly the same thing in a state: an avaricious man in office is in confederacy with the whole *clan* of his district or dependence, which in modern terms of art is called, "To live, and let live;" and yet *their* gains are the smallest part of the

[1] The Commissioners for examining the public accounts reported to the House of Commons (December 21st, 1711) that the Duke of Marlborough had received from Sir Solomon de Medina (army contractor for bread) and his predecessor, during the years 1702 to 1711, a sum of £63,319 3*s*. 7*d*. "In this report was contained the deposition of Sir Solomon Medina, charging the Duke of Marlborough and Adam Cardonell, his secretary, of various peculations, with regard to the contracts for bread and bread-wagons for the army in Flanders." The Duke admitted the fact in a letter to the Queen, dated November 10th, 1711, but said that the whole sum had "been constantly employed for the service of the public, in keeping secret correspondence, and in getting intelligence of the enemy's motions and designs" (Macpherson's "Great Britain," ii. 512; Tindal's "History," iv. 232; and "Journals of House of Commons," xvii. 16). [T. S.]

public's loss. Give a guinea to a knavish land-waiter, and he shall connive at the merchant for cheating the Queen of an hundred. A brewer gives a bribe to have the privilege of selling drink to the Navy; but the fraud is ten times greater than the bribe, and the public is at the whole loss.[1]

Moralists make two kinds of avarice; that of Catiline, *alieni appetens, sui profusus;*[2] and the other more generally understood by that name; which is, the endless desire of hoarding: But I take the former to be more dangerous in a state, because it mingles well with ambition, which I think the latter cannot; for though the same breast may be capable of admitting both, it is not able to cultivate them; and where the love of heaping wealth prevails, there is not in my opinion, much to be apprehended from ambition. The disgrace of that sordid vice is sooner apt to spread than any other, and is always attended with the hatred and scorn of the people: so that whenever those two passions happen to meet in the same subject, it is not unlikely that Providence hath placed avarice to be a check upon ambition; and I have reason to think, some great ministers of state have been of my opinion.

The divine authority of Holy Writ, the precepts of philosophers, the lashes and ridicule of satirical poets, have been all employed in exploding this insatiable thirst of money, and all equally controlled by the daily practice of mankind. Nothing new remains to be said upon the occasion, and if there did, I must remember my character, that I am an *Examiner* only, and not a Reformer.

However, in those cases where the frailties of particular men do nearly affect the public welfare, such as a prime minister of state, or a great general of an army; methinks there should be some expedient contrived, to let them know impartially what is the world's opinion in the point: Encompassed with a crowd of depending flatterers, they are many degrees blinder to their own faults than the common infirmities of human nature can plead in their excuse; Advice dares not be offered, or is wholly lost, or returned

[1] See the remarks in No. 39, *post*, p. 250. [T. S.]

[2] Sallust, "Catiline," 5. "Greedy of what was not his own, lavish of what was." Catiline was extravagant and profligate, and quite unscrupulous in the pursuit of his many pleasures. [T. S.]

with hatred: and whatever appears in public against their prevailing vice, goes for nothing; being either not applied, or passing only for libel and slander, proceeding from the malice and envy of a party.

I have sometimes thought, that if I had lived at Rome in the time of the first Triumvirate, I should have been tempted to write a letter, as from an unknown hand, to those three great men, who had then usurped the sovereign power; wherein I would freely and sincerely tell each of them that fault which I conceived was most odious, and of most consequence to the commonwealth: That, to Crassus, should have been sent to him after his conquests in Mesopotamia, and in the following terms.[1]

"*To Marcus Crassus, health.*

"*If you apply as you ought, what I now write,*[2] *you will be more obliged to me than to all the world, hardly excepting your parents or your country. I intend to tell you, without disguise or prejudice, the opinion which the world has entertained of you: and to let you see I write this without any sort of ill will, you shall first hear the sentiments they have to your advantage. No man disputes the gracefulness of your person; you are allowed to have a good and clear understanding, cultivated by the knowledge of men and manners, though not by literature. You are no ill orator in the Senate; you are said to excel in the art of bridling and subduing your anger, and stifling or concealing your resentments. You have been a most successful general, of long experience, great conduct, and much personal courage. You*

[1] A most severe censure on the Duke of Marlborough. [T. S.]

[2] Commenting on this "The Medley" (No. 20, February 12th, 1711) remarks: "Of all that ever made it their business to defame, there never was such a bungler sure as my friend. He writes a letter now to Crassus, as a man marked out for destruction, because that hint was given him six months ago; and does not seem to know yet that he is still employed, and that in attacking him, he affronts the Q[uee]n."

Writing to Stella, under date February 18th, Swift says: "Lord Rivers, talking to me the other day, cursed the paper called 'The Examiner,' for speaking civilly of the Duke of Marlborough: this I happened to talk of to the Secretary [St. John], who blamed the warmth of that lord, and some others, and swore, that, if their advice were followed, they would be blown up in twenty-four hours" (vol. ii., p. 123 of present edition). [T. S.]

have gained many important victories for the commonwealth, and forced the strongest towns in Mesopotamia to surrender, for which frequent supplications have been decreed by the Senate. Yet with all these qualities, and this merit, give me leave to say, you are neither beloved by the patricians or plebeians at home, nor by the officers or private soldiers of your own army abroad: And, do you know, Crassus, that this is owing to a fault, of which you may cure yourself, by one minute's reflection? What shall I say? You are the richest person in the commonwealth; you have no male child, your daughters are all married to wealthy patricians; you are far in the decline of life; and yet you are deeply stained with that odious and ignoble vice of covetousness:[1] *It is affirmed, that you descend even to the meanest and most scandalous degrees of it; and while you possess so many millions, while you are daily acquiring so many more, you are solicitous how to save a single sesterce, of which a hundred ignominious instances are produced, and in all men's mouths. I will only mention that passage of the buskins,*[2] *which after abundance of persuasion, you would hardly suffer to be cut from your legs, when they were so wet and cold, that to have kept them on, would have endangered your life.*

Instead of using the common arguments to dissuade you from this weakness, I will endeavour to convince you, that you are really guilty of it, and leave the cure to your own good sense. For perhaps, you are not yet persuaded that this is your crime, you have probably never yet been reproached for it to your face, and what you are now told, comes from one unknown, and it may be, from an enemy. You will allow yourself indeed to be prudent in the management of your fortune; you are not a prodigal, like Clodius[3] *or Catiline, but surely that deserves not the name of avarice. I will*

[1] To Stella Swift writes somewhat later (March 7th): "Yes, I do read the 'Examiners,' and they are written very finely as you judge. I do not think they are too severe on the Duke; they only tax him of avarice, and his avarice has ruined us. You may count upon all things in them to be true. The author has said, it is not Prior; but perhaps it may be Atterbury" (vol. ii., p. 133 of present edition). [T. S.]

[2] Wet stockings. [FAULKNER.]

[3] Clodius Albinus, the Roman general, died 197 A.D. The reference here is to the Earl of Wharton (see No. 27, *ante*, p. 169). [T. S.]

inform you how to be convinced. Disguise your person; go among the common people in Rome; introduce discourses about yourself; inquire your own character; do the same in your camp, walk about it in the evening, hearken at every tent, and if you do not hear every mouth censuring, lamenting, cursing this vice in you, and even you for this vice, conclude yourself innocent. If you are not yet persuaded, send for Atticus,[1] *Servius Sulpicius, Cato or Brutus, they are all your friends; conjure them to tell you ingenuously which is your great fault, and which they would chiefly wish you to correct; if they do not all agree in their verdict, in the name of all the gods, you are acquitted.*

When your adversaries reflect how far you are gone in this vice, they are tempted to talk as if we owed our success, not to your courage or conduct, but to those veteran troops you command, who are able to conquer under any general, with so many brave and experienced officers to lead them. Besides, we know the consequences your avarice hath often occasioned. The soldier hath been starving for bread, surrounded with plenty, and in an enemy's country, but all under safeguards and contributions; which if you had sometimes pleased to have exchanged for provisions, might at the expense of a few talents in a campaign, have so endeared you to the army, that they would have desired you to lead them to the utmost limits of Asia. But you rather chose to confine your conquests within the fruitful country of Mesopotamia, where plenty of money might be raised. How far that fatal greediness of gold may have influenced you, in breaking off the treaty[2] *with the old Parthian King Orodes,*[3] *you best can tell; your enemies charge you with it, your friends offer nothing material in your defence; and all agree, there is nothing so pernicious, which the extremes of avarice may not be able to inspire.*

The moment you quit this vice, you will be a truly great man; and still there will imperfections enough remain to convince us, you are not a god. Farewell."

[1] T. Pomponius Atticus, the friend and correspondent of Cicero. [T. S.]

[2] The Treaty of Gertruydenberg (see No. 14, *ante*, and note on p. 77; see also note on pp. 201-2 of vol. v. of present edition). [T. S.]

[3] Orodes I. (Arsaces XIV.), King of Parthia, defeated Crassus, B.C. 53. [T. S.]

Perhaps a letter of this nature, sent to so reasonable a man as Crassus, might have put him upon *Examining* into himself, and correcting that little sordid appetite, so utterly inconsistent with all pretences to a hero. A youth in the heat of blood may plead with some shew of reason, that he is not able to subdue his lusts; An ambitious man may use the same arguments for his love of power, or perhaps other arguments to justify it. But, excess of avarice hath neither of these pleas to offer; it is not to be justified, and cannot pretend temptation for excuse: Whence can the temptation come? Reason disclaims it altogether, and it cannot be said to lodge in the blood, or the animal spirits. So that I conclude, no man of true valour and true understanding, upon whom this vice has stolen unawares, when he is convinced he is guilty, will suffer it to remain in his breast an hour.

NUMB. 29.[1]

FROM THURSDAY FEBRUARY 8, TO THURSDAY FEBRUARY 15. 1710-11.

Inultus ut tu riseris Cotyttia?[2]

An Answer to the "Letter to the Examiner."[3]

London, Feb. 15, $17\frac{10}{11}$.

SIR,

THOUGH I have wanted leisure to acknowledge the honour of a letter you were pleased to write to me about six months ago; yet I have been very careful in obeying some of your commands, and am going on as fast as I can with the rest. I wish you had thought fit to have conveyed them to me by a more private hand, than that of the printing-house: for though I was pleased with a pattern of style and spirit which I proposed to imitate, yet I was sorry the world should be a witness how far I fell short in both.

I am afraid you did not consider what an abundance of work you have cut out for me; neither am I at all comforted by the promise you are so kind to make, that when I have performed my task,[4] "D[olbe]n shall blush in his

[1] No. 28 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Horace, "Epodes," xvii. 56.

"Safely shalt thou Cotytto's rites
Divulge?"—J. DUNCOMBE.
[T. S.]

[3] "A Letter to the Examiner. Printed in the year, 1710," appeared shortly after the issue of the second number of "The Examiner." It was attributed to St. John. [T. S.]

[4] The writer of the "Letter" invited the "Examiner" to "paint . . . the present state of the war abroad, and expose to public view those principles upon which, of late, it has been carried on . . .

grave among the dead, W[alpo]le among the living, and even Vol[pon]e shall feel some remorse." How the gentleman in his grave may have kept his countenance, I cannot inform you, having no acquaintance at all with the sexton; but for the other two, I take leave to assure you, there have not yet appeared the least signs of blushing or remorse in either, though some very good opportunities have offered, if they had thought fit to accept them; so that with your permission, I had rather engage to continue this work till they are in their graves too, which I am sure will happen much sooner than the other.

You desire I would collect "some of those indignities offered last year to her M[ajest]y." I am ready to oblige you; and have got a pretty tolerable collection by me, which I am in doubt whether to publish by itself in a large volume in folio, or scatter them here and there occasionally in my papers. Though indeed I am sometimes thinking to stifle them altogether; because such a history will be apt to give foreigners a monstrous opinion of our country. But since it is your absolute opinion, the world should be informed; I will with the first occasion pick out a few choice instances, and let them take their chance in the ensuing papers. I have likewise in my cabinet certain quires of paper filled with facts of corruption, mismanagement, cowardice, treachery, avarice, ambition, and the like, with an alphabetical table, to save trouble. And perhaps you will not wonder at the care I take to be so well provided, when you consider the vast expense I am at: I feed weekly two or three wit-starved writers, who have no other visible support; besides several others that live upon my offals. In short, I am like a nurse who suckles twins at one time, and has likewise one or two whelps constantly to draw her breasts.

I must needs confess, (and it is with grief I speak it) that I have been the innocent cause of a great circulation of dullness: at the same time, I have often wondered how it has come to pass, that these industrious people, after poring

Collect some few of the indignities which have been this year offered to her Majesty. . . . When this is done, D—n shall blush in his grave among the dead, W—le among the living, and even Vol—e shall feel some remorse." [T. S.]

so constantly upon the "Examiner,"[1] a paper writ with plain sense, and in a tolerable style, have made so little improvement. I am sure it would have fallen out quite otherwise with me; for, by what I have seen of their performances (and I am credibly informed they are all of a piece) if I had perused them till now, I should have been fit for little but to make an advocate in the same cause.

You, Sir, perhaps will wonder, as most others do, what end these angry folks propose, in writing perpetually against the "Examiner": it is not to beget a better opinion of the late ministry, or with any hope to convince the world that I am in the wrong in any one fact I relate; they know all that to be lost labour; and yet their design is important enough: they would fain provoke me by all sort of methods, within the length of their capacity, to answer their papers; which would render mine wholly useless to the public; for if it once came to rejoinder and reply, we should be all upon a level, and then their work would be done.

There is one gentleman indeed, who has written three small pamphlets upon "the Management of the War," and "the Treaty of Peace:"[2] These I had intended to have bestowed a paper in *Examining*, and could easily have made it appear, that whatever he says of truth, relates nothing at all to the evils we complain of, or controls one syllable of

[1] "The Medley" treated "The Examiner" with scant courtesy, and never failed to cast ridicule on its work. In No. 21 (February 19th, 1711) the writer says: "No man of common sense ever thought any body wrote the paper but Abel Roper, or some of his allies, there being not one quality in 'The Examiner' which Abel has not eminently distinguished himself by since he set up for a political writer. 'Tis true, Abel is the more modest of the two, and it never entered into his head to say, as my friend does of his paper, 'Tis writ with plain sense and in a tolerable style.'" In No. 23 (March 5th) he says: "There is indeed a great resemblance between his brother Abel and himself; and I find a great dispute among the party, to which of them to give the preference. They are both news writers, as they utter things which no body ever heard of *but from their papers.*"

Abel Roper conducted the Tory paper called "The Post Boy." (See note on p. 290 of vol. v. of present edition.) [T. S.]

[2] Two of these pamphlets were already referred to in a postscript to No. 24 of "The Examiner" (see note, p. 151). The third was "The Negociations for a Treaty of Peace, in 1709. Consider'd, In a Third Letter to a Tory-Member. Part the First." Dated December 22nd, 1710. The "Fourth Letter" was dated January 10th, 17$\frac{10}{11}$. [T. S.]

what I have ever advanced. Nobody that I know of did ever dispute the Duke of M[arlboroug]h's courage, conduct or success, they have been always unquestionable, and will continue to be so, in spite of the malice of his enemies, or, which is yet more, the *weakness of his advocates.* The nation only wished to see him taken out of ill hands, and put into better. But, what is all this to the conduct of the late m[i]n[i]stry, the shameful mismanagements in Spain, or the wrong steps in the treaty of peace, the secret of which will not bear the light, and is consequently by this author very poorly defended? These and many other things I would have shewn; but upon second thoughts determined to have done it in a discourse by itself,[1] rather than take up room here, and break into the design of this paper, from whence I have resolved to banish controversy as much as possible. But the postscript to his third pamphlet was enough to disgust me from having any dealings at all with such a writer; unless that part was left to some footman[2] he had picked up among the boys who follow the camp, whose character it would suit much better than that of the supposed author.[3] At least, the foul language, the idle impotent menace, and the gross perverting of an innocent expression in the 4th "Examiner,"[4] joined to that respect I shall ever

[1] It may be that Swift's intention was carried out in two pamphlets, one entitled, "An Examination of the Management of the War. In a Letter to My Lord * * *," published March 3rd, 171¼; and the other styled, "An Examination of the Third and Fourth Letters to a Tory Member, relating to the Negociations for a Treaty of Peace in 1709. In a Second Letter to My Lord * * *" [With a Postscript to the Medley's Footman], published March 15th of the same year. [T. S.]

[2] The postscript to "An Examination of the Third and Fourth Letters" mentions a pamphlet, "An Answer to the Examination of the Management of the War," by the Medley's Footman. "The Medley," No. 21 (February 19th), remarks: "He could also prove there were wrong steps in the Treaty of Peace, the Allies would have all; but he won't do it, because he is treated like a footman." [T. S.]

[3] *I.e.* Dr. Francis Hare. [T. S.]

[4] Dr. Hare, in the postscript to his third pamphlet, said: "The Examiner is extremely mistaken, if he thinks I shall enter the lists with so prostitute a writer, who can neither speak truth, nor knows when he hears it." He calls the writer "a mercenary scribbler," and speaks of his paper as "weekly libels." He then quotes an expression from the fourth number (published before Swift undertook "The Examiner"), and concludes by saying that he had met more than his

have for the function of a divine, would incline me to believe so. But when he turns off his footman, and disclaims that postscript, I will tear it out, and see how far the rest deserves to be considered.

But, Sir, I labour under a much greater difficulty, upon which I should be glad to hear your advice. I am worried on one side by the Whigs for being too severe, and by the Tories on the other for being too gentle. I have formerly hinted a complaint of this; but having lately received two peculiar letters, among many others, I thought nothing could better represent my condition, or the opinion which the warm men of both sides have of my conduct, than to send you a transcript of each. The former is exactly in these words.

"*To the 'Examiner.'*

"*Mr. Examiner,*

"*By your continual reflecting upon the conduct of the late m[i]n[i]stry, and by your encomiums on the present, it is as clear as the sun at noon-day, that your are a Jesuit or Non-juror, employed by the friends of the Pretender, to endeavour to introduce Popery, and slavery, and arbitrary power, and to infringe the sacred Act of Toleration of Dissenters. Now, Sir, since the most ingenious authors who write weekly against you, are not able to teach you better manners, I would have you to know, that those great and excellent men, as low as you think them at present, do not want friends that will take the first proper occasion to cut your throat, as all such enemies to*

match in the ingenious writer of "The Medley," even were he much abler than he is.

The fourth "Examiner" had printed a "Letter from the Country," in which the following passage occurs: "Can any wise people think it possible, that the Crown should be so mad as to choose ministers, who would not support public credit? . . . This is such a wildness as is never . . . to be met with in the Roman story; except in a devouring Sejanus at home, or an ambitious Catiline at the head of a mercenary army."

The writer of "An Examination of the Third and Fourth Letters," says: "The words indeed are in the paper quoted, that is, 'The Examiner,' No. 4, but the application is certainly the proper thought of the author of the postscript" (p. 28). [T. S.]

moderation ought to be served. It is well you have cleared another person[1] *from being author of your cursed libels; though d—mme, perhaps after all, that may be a bamboozle too. However I hope we shall soon ferret you out. Therefore I advise you as a friend, to let fall your pen, and retire betimes; for our patience is now at an end. It is enough to lose our power and employments, without setting the whole nation against us. Consider three years is the life of a party; and d—mme, every dog has his day, and it will be our turn next; therefore take warning, and learn to sleep in a whole skin, or whenever we are uppermost, by G—d you shall find no mercy.*"

The other letter was in the following terms.

"*To the 'Examiner.'*

"*Sir,*

"*I am a country member, and constantly send a dozen of your papers down to my electors. I have read them all, but I confess not with the satisfaction I expected. It is plain you know a great deal more than you write; why will you not let us have it all out? We are told, that the Qu*[een] *has been a long time treated with insolence by those she has most obliged; Pray, Sir, let us have a few good stories upon that head. We have been cheated of several millions; why will you not set a mark on the knaves who are guilty, and shew us what ways they took to rob the public at such a rate? Inform us how we came to be disappointed of peace about two years ago: In short, turn the whole mystery of iniquity inside-out, that every body may have a view of it. But above all, explain to us, what was at the bottom of that same impeachment: I am sure I never liked it; for at that very time, a dissenting preacher in our neighbourhood, came often to see our parson; it could be for no good, for he would walk about the barns and stables, and desire to look into the church, as who should say, These will shortly be mine; and we all believed he was then contriving some alterations against he got into possession: And I shall never forget, that a Whig justice offered me then very high for my bishop's lease. I must*

[1] *I.e.* Prior. See No. 27, p. 168. [T. S.]

be so bold to tell you, Sir, that you are too favourable: I am sure, there was no living in quiet for us while they were in the saddle. I was turned out of the commission, and called a Jacobite, though it cost me a thousand pound in joining with the Prince of Orange at the Revolution. The discoveries I would have you make, are of some facts for which they ought to be hanged; not that I value their heads, but I would see them exposed, which may be done upon the owners' shoulders, as well as upon a pole, &c."

These, Sir, are the sentiments of a whole party on one side, and of considerable numbers on the other: however, taking the *medium* between these extremes, I think to go on as I have hitherto done, though I am sensible my paper would be more popular, if I did not lean too much to the favourable side. For nothing delights the people more than to see their oppressors humbled, and all their actions, painted with proper colours, set out in open view. *Exactos tyrannos densum humeris bibit aure volgus.*[1]

But as for the Whigs, I am in some doubt whether this mighty concern they shew for the honour of the late ministry, may not be affected, at least whether their masters will thank them for their zeal in such a cause. It is I think, a known story of a gentleman who fought another for calling him "son of a whore;" but the lady desired her son to make no more quarrels upon that subject, *because it was true.* For pray, Sir; does it not look like a jest, that such a pernicious crew, after draining our wealth, and discovering the most destructive designs against our Church and State, instead of thanking fortune that they are got off safe in their persons and plunder, should hire these bullies of the pen to defend their reputations? I remember I thought it the hardest case in the world, when a poor acquaintance of mine, having fallen among sharpers, where he lost all his money, and then complaining he was cheated, got a good beating into the bargain, for offering to affront gentlemen. I believe the

[1] Horace, "Odes," II. xiii. 31-2.

"Tyrants slain,
In thicker crowds the shadowy throng
Drink deeper down the martial song."—P. FRANCIS.
[T. S.]

only reason why these purloiners of the public, cause such a clutter to be made about their reputations, is to prevent inquisitions, that might tend towards making them refund: like those women they call shoplifters, who when they are challenged for their thefts, appear to be mighty angry and affronted, for fear of being searched.

I will dismiss you, Sir, when I have taken notice of one particular. Perhaps you may have observed in the tolerated factious papers of the week, that the E[arl] of R[ochester][1] is frequently reflected on for having been ecclesiastical commissioner and lord treasurer, in the reign of the late King James. The fact is true; and it will not be denied to his immortal honour, that because he could not comply with the measures then taking, he resigned both those employments; of which the latter was immediately supplied by a commission, composed of two popish lords and the present E[ar]l of G[o]d[o]l[phi]n.[2]

[1] Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester, was lord treasurer from 168$\frac{4}{5}$ to 168$\frac{8}{7}$, when five commissioners were appointed: Lord Belasyse, Lord Godolphin, Lord Dover, Sir John Ernle (chancellor of the exchequer), and Sir Stephen Foxe. [T. S.]

[2] "The Medley," No. 22 (February 26th, 1711) remarks on this: "He might have said with as much truth, 'twas supplied by my Lord G—— and two Protestant knights, Sir Stephen Fox and Sir John Ernle." [T. S.]

NUMB. 30.[1]

FROM THURSDAY FEBRUARY 15, TO THURSDAY FEBRUARY 22. 1710-11.

Laus summa in fortunae bonis, non extulisse se in potestate, non fuisse insolentem in pecuniâ, non se praetulisse aliis propter abundantiam fortunae.[2]

I AM conscious to myself that I write this paper with no other intention but that of doing good: I never received injury from the late ministry, nor advantage from the present, further than in common with every good subject. There were among the former one or two, who must be allowed to have possessed very valuable qualities; but proceeding by a system of politics, which our constitution could not suffer; and discovering a contempt of all religion, but especially of that which hath been so happily established among us ever since the Reformation, they seem to have been justly suspected of no very good inclinations to either.

It is possible, that a man may speculatively prefer the constitution of another country, or an Utopia of his own, before that of the nation where he is born and lives; yet from considering the dangers of innovation, the corruptions of mankind, and the frequent impossibility of reducing ideas to practice, he may join heartily in preserving the present order of things, and be a true friend to the government already settled. So in religion; a man may perhaps have

[1] No. 29 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] "Tractanda in laudationibus etiam haec sunt naturae et fortunae bona, in quibus est summa laus: non extulisse," etc.—CICERO, *De Oratore*, ii. 84.

"These blessings of nature and fortune fall within the province of panegyric, the highest strain of which is, that a man possessed power without pride, riches without insolence, and the fullness of fortune without the arrogance of greatness."—W. GUTHRIE. [T. S.]

little or none of it at heart; yet if he conceals his opinions, if he endeavours to make no proselytes, advances no impious tenets in writing or discourse: if, according to the common atheistical notion, he believes religion to be only a contrivance of politicians for keeping the vulgar in awe, and that the present model is better adjusted than any other to so useful an end: though the condition of such a man as to his own future state be very deplorable; yet Providence, which often works good out of evil, can make even such a man an instrument for contributing toward the preservation of the Church.

On the other side, I take a state to be truly in danger, both as to its religion and government, when a set of ambitious politicians, bred up in a hatred to the constitution, and a contempt for all religion, are forced upon exerting these qualities in order to keep or increase their power, by widening their bottom, and taking in (like Mahomet) some principles from every party, that is any way discontented at the present faith and settlement; which was manifestly our case. Upon this occasion I remember to have asked some considerable Whigs, whether it did not bring a disreputation upon their body, to have the whole herd of Presbyterians, Independents, Atheists, Anabaptists, Deists, Quakers and Socinians, openly and universally listed under their banners? They answered, that all this was absolutely necessary, in order to make a balance against the Tories, and all little enough: for indeed, it was as much as they could possibly do, though assisted with the absolute power of disposing every employment; while the bulk of English gentry kept firm to their old principles in Church and State.

But notwithstanding whatever I have hitherto said, I am informed, several among the Whigs continue still so refractory, that they will hardly allow the heads of their party to have entertained any designs of ruining the constitution, or that they would have endeavoured it, if they had continued in power. I beg their pardon if I have discovered a secret; but who could imagine they ever intended it should be one, after those overt acts with which they thought fit to conclude their farce? But perhaps they *now* find it convenient to deny vigorously, that the question may remain;

"Why was the old ministry changed?" which they urge on without ceasing, as if no occasion in the least had been given, but that all were owing to the insinuations of crafty men, practising upon the weakness of an easy pr[inc]e. I shall therefore offer among a hundred, one reason for this change, which I think would justify any monarch that ever reigned, for the like proceeding.

It is notorious enough, how highly princes have been blamed in the histories of all countries, particularly of our own; upon the account of minions; who have been ever justly odious to the people, for their insolence and avarice, and engrossing the favour of their masters. Whoever has been the least conversant in the English story cannot but have heard of Gaveston,[1] the Spencers,[2] and the Earl of Oxford;[3] who by the excess and abuse of their power, cost the princes they served, or rather governed, their crowns and lives. However, in the case of minions, it must at least be acknowledged that the prince is pleased and happy, though his subjects be aggrieved; and he has the plea of friendship to excuse him, which is a disposition of generous minds. Besides, a wise minion, though he be haughty to others, is humble and insinuating to his master, and cultivates his favour by obedience and respect. But *our* misfortune has been a great deal worse: we have suffered for some years under the oppression, the avarice and insolence of those, for whom the Qu[ee]n had neither esteem nor friendship; who rather seemed to snatch their own dues, than receive the favour of their sovereign, and were so far from returning respect, that they forgot common good manners. They imposed on their prince, by urging the necessity of affairs of their own creating: they first raised difficulties, and then offered them as arguments to keep themselves in power. They united themselves against nature and principle, to a party they had always abhorred, and which was now content to come in upon any terms, leaving them and their creatures in full possession of the court. Then they urged the for-

[1] Piers Gaveston, Earl of Cornwall, the favourite of Edward II. [T. S.]

[2] Hugh le Despencer, Earl of Winchester, and his son of the same name, both favourites of Edward II., and both hanged in 1326. [T. S.]

[3] Robert de Vere, Earl of Oxford, favourite of Richard II. [T. S.]

midable strength of that party, and the dangers which must follow by disobliging of it. So that it seems almost a miracle, how a prince, thus besieged on all sides, could *alone* have courage and prudence enough to extricate herself.

And indeed there is a point of history relating to this matter, which well deserves to be considered. When her M[ajest]y came to the crown, she took into favour and employment, several persons who were esteemed the best friends of the old constitution; among whom none were reckoned further gone in the high church principles (as they are usually called) than two or three, who had at that time most credit, and ever since, till within these few months, possessed all power at court. So that the first umbrage given to the Whigs, and the pretences for clamouring against France and the Pretender, were derived from them. And I believe nothing appeared then more unlikely, than that such different opinions should ever incorporate; that party having upon former occasions treated those very persons with enmity enough. But some l[or]ds then about court, and in the Qu[een]'s good graces, not able to endure those growing impositions upon the prince and people, presumed to interpose, and were consequently soon removed and disgraced: However, when a most exorbitant grant was proposed,[1] antecedent to any visible merit, it miscarried in Parliament, for want of being seconded by those who had most credit in the House, and who having always opposed the like excesses in a former reign, thought it their duty to do so still, to shew the world that the dislike was not against persons but things. But this was to cross the oligarchy in the tenderest point, a point which outweighed all considerations of duty and gratitude to their prince, or regard to the constitution. And therefore after having in several private meetings concerted measures with their old enemies, and granted as well as received conditions, they began to change their style and their countenance, and to put it as a maxim in the mouths of their emissaries, that England must be saved by the Whigs. This unnatural league was afterwards cultivated by another incident; I mean the Act of Security,[2] and the con-

[1] See No. 17, *ante*, and note, p. 95. [T. S.]

[2] The Bill of Security passed the Scottish Parliament in 1703, but was refused the Royal Assent. It provided for the separation of the

sequences of it, which every body knows; when (to use the words of my correspondent)[1] "the sovereign authority was parcelled out among a faction, and made the purchase of indemnity for an offending M[iniste]r:" Thus the union of the two kingdoms improved that between the ministry and the j[u]nto, which was afterwards cemented by their mutual danger in that storm they so narrowly escaped about three years ago;[2] but however was not quite perfected till the Prince's death;[3] and then they went lovingly on together, both satisfied with their several shares, at full liberty to gratify their predominant inclinations; the first, their avarice and ambition; the other, their models of innovation in Church and State.

Letter to the Examiner.

Therefore, whoever thinks fit to revive that baffled question, "Why was the late ministry changed?" may receive the following answer; That it was become necessary by the insolence and avarice of some about the Qu[een], who in order to perpetuate their tyranny had made a monstrous alliance with those who profess principles destructive to our religion and government: If this will not suffice, let him make an abstract of all the abuses I have mentioned in my former papers, and view them together; after which if he still remains unsatisfied, let him suspend his opinion a few weeks longer. Though after all, I think the question as trifling as that of the Papists, when they ask us, "where was our religion before Luther?" And indeed, the ministry was changed for the same reason that religion was reformed, because a thousand corruptions had crept into the discipline and doctrine of the state, by the pride, the avarice, the fraud, and the ambition of those who administered to us in secular affairs.

Crowns of England and Scotland unless security was given to the latter for full religious and commercial independence. It was again passed in 1704. (See also note in vol. v., p. 336 of present edition.) [T. S.]

[1] The writer of the "Letter" does not ascribe this result to the Act of Security, but to the Queen raising some of her servants to the highest degree of power who were unable "to associate with men of honester principles than themselves," which led to "subjection to the will of an arbitrary junto and to the caprice of an insolent woman." [T. S.]

[2] The Duke of Marlborough and Lord Godolphin threatened to resign in February, 170⅞, unless Harley was dismissed. [T. S.]

[3] Prince George died October 28th, 1708. [T. S.]

I heard myself censured the other day in a coffee-house, for seeming to glance in the letter to Crassus,[1] against a great man, who is still in employment, and likely to continue so. What if I had really intended that such an application should be given it? I cannot perceive how I could be justly blamed for so gentle a reproof. If I saw a handsome young fellow going to a ball at court with a great smut upon his face, could he take it ill in me to point out the place, and desire him with abundance of good words to pull out his handkerchief and wipe it off; or bring him to a glass, where he might plainly see it with his own eyes? Does any man think I shall suffer my pen to inveigh against vices, only because they are charged upon persons who are no longer in power? Every body knows, that certain vices are more or less pernicious, according to the stations of those who possess them. For example, lewdness and intemperance are not of so bad consequences in a town rake as a divine. Cowardice in a lawyer is more supportable than in an officer of the army. If I should find fault with an admiral because he wanted politeness, or an alderman for not understanding Greek; that indeed would be to go out of my way, for an occasion of quarrelling; but excessive avarice in a g[enera]l, is I think the greatest defect he can be liable to, next to those of courage and conduct, and may be attended with the most ruinous consequences, as it was in Crassus, who to that vice alone owed the destruction of himself and his army.[2] It is the same thing in praising men's excellencies, which are more or less valuable, as the person you commend has occasion to employ them. A man may perhaps mean honestly, yet if he be not able to spell, he shall never have my vote for a secretary: Another may have wit and learning in a post where honesty, with plain common sense, are of much more use: You may praise a soldier for his skill at chess, because it is said to be a military game, and the emblem of drawing up an army;

[1] "The Medley," No. 20 (February 12th) was largely taken up with remarks on this letter, which appeared in "The Examiner," No. 28. See passage there quoted in the note, p. 177. [T. S.]

[2] Crassus was defeated by Orodes, King of Parthia, through the treachery of Ariamnes. After Crassus was beheaded Orodes caused molten gold to be poured into his mouth. [T. S.]

but this to a tr[easure]r would be no more a compliment, than if you called him a gamester or a jockey.[1]

P.S. I received a letter relating to Mr. Greenshields; the person who sent it may know, that I will say something to it in the next paper.

[1] Godolphin. See No. 27, *ante*, p. 172. [T. S.]

NUMB. 31.[1]

FROM THURSDAY FEBRUARY 22, TO THURSDAY MARCH 1. 1710-11.

Quae enim domus tam stabilis, quae tam firma civitas est, quae non odiis atque discidiis funditus possit everti?[2]

IF we examine what societies of men are in closest union among themselves, we shall find them either to be those who are engaged in some evil design, or who labour under one common misfortune: Thus the troops of *banditti* in several countries abroad, the knots of highwaymen in our own nation, the several tribes of sharpers, thieves and pick-pockets, with many others, are so firmly knit together, that nothing is more difficult than to break or dissolve their several gangs. So likewise those who are fellow-sufferers under any misfortune, whether it be in reality or opinion, are usually contracted into a very strict union; as we may observe in the Papists throughout this kingdom, under those real difficulties which are justly put on them; and in the several schisms of Presbyterians, and other sects, under that grievous persecution of the modern kind, called want of power. And the reason why such confederacies, are kept so sacred and inviolable, is very plain, because in each of those cases I have mentioned, the whole body is moved by one common spirit, in pursuit of one general end, and the interest of individuals is not crossed by each other, or by the whole.

Now, both these motives are joined to unite the high-flying Whigs at present: they have been always engaged in

[1] No. 30 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Cicero, "De Amicitiâ," vii. "For what family is so firmly rooted, what state so strong, as not to be liable to complete overthrow from hatred and strife."—G. H. WELLS. [T. S.]

an evil design, and of late they are faster rivetted by that terrible calamity, the loss of power. So that whatever designs a mischievous crew of dark confederates may possibly entertain, who will stop at no means to compass them, may be justly apprehended from these.

On the other side, those who wish well to the public, and would gladly contribute to its service, are apt to differ in their opinions about the methods of promoting it, and when their party flourishes, are sometimes envious at those in power, ready to overvalue their own merit, and be impatient till it is rewarded by the measure they have prescribed for themselves. There is a further topic of contention, which a ruling party is apt to fall into, in relation to retrospections, and enquiry into past miscarriages; wherein some are thought too warm and zealous; others too cool and remiss; while in the meantime these divisions are industriously fomented by the discarded faction; which though it be an old practice, hath been much improved in the schools of the Jesuits, who when they despaired of perverting this nation to popery, by arguments or plots against the state, sent their emissaries to subdivide us into schisms.[1] And this expedient is now with great propriety taken up by our men of incensed moderation, because they suppose themselves able to attack the strongest of our subdivisions, and so subdue us one after another. Nothing better resembles this proceeding, than that famous combat between the Horatii and Curiatii,[2] where two of the former being killed, the third, who remained entire and untouched, was able to kill his three wounded adversaries, after he had divided them by a stratagem. I well know with how tender a hand all this should be touched; yet at the same time I think it my duty to warn the friends as well as expose the enemies of the public weal, and to begin preaching up union upon the first suspicion that any steps are made to disturb it.

But the two chief subjects of discontent, which, in most great changes, in the management of public affairs, are apt

[1] Refers to the October Club. See Swift's "Memoirs Relating to that Change," etc. (vol. v., pp. 385-6 of present edition). [T. S.]

[2] The contest is the subject of one of Macaulay's "Lays." Three brothers named Horatius fought with three named Curiatius, and the fight resulted in Publius Horatius being the sole survivor. [T. S.]

to breed differences among those who are in possession, are what I have just now mentioned; a desire of punishing the corruptions of former managers; and the rewarding merit, among those who have been any way instrumental or consenting to the change. The first of these is a point so nice, that I shall purposely waive it; but the latter I take to fall properly within my district: By merit I here understand that value which every man puts upon his own deservings from the public. And I believe there could not be a more difficult employment found out, than that of paymaster general to this sort of merit; or a more noisy, crowded place, than a court of judicature, erected to settle and adjust every man's claim upon that article. I imagine, if this had fallen into the fancy of the ancient poets, they would have dressed it up after their manner into an agreeable fiction, and given us a genealogy and description of merit, perhaps not very different from that which follows.

A Poetical Genealogy and Description of MERIT.

THAT true Merit, was the son of Virtue and Honour; but that there was likewise a spurious child who usurped the name, and whose parents were Vanity and Impudence. That, at a distance, there was a great resemblance between them, and they were often mistaken for each other. That the bastard issue had a loud shrill voice, which was perpetually employed in cravings and complaints; while the other never spoke louder than a whisper, and was often so bashful that he could not speak at all. That in all great assemblies, the false Merit would step before the true, and stand just in his way; was constantly at court, or great men's levees, or whispering in some minister's ear. That the more you fed him, the more hungry and importunate he grew. That he often passed for the true son of Virtue and Honour, and the genuine for an impostor. That he was born distorted and a dwarf, but by force of art appeared of a handsome shape, and taller than the usual size; and that none but those who were wise and good, as well as vigilant, could discover his littleness or deformity. That the true Merit had been often forced to the indignity of applying to the false, for his credit

with those in power, and to keep himself from starving. That he filled the antechambers with a crew of his dependants and creatures, such as projectors, schematists, occasional converts to a party, prostitute flatterers, starveling writers, buffoons, shallow politicians, empty orators, and the like, who all owned him for their patron, and grew discontented if they were not immediately fed.

This metaphorical description of false Merit, is, I doubt, calculated for most countries in Christendom; and as to our own, I believe it may be said with a sufficient reserve of charity, that we are fully able to reward every man among us according to his real deservings. And I think I may add, without suspicion of flattery, that never any prince had a ministry with a better judgment to distinguish between false and real merit, than that which is now at the helm; or whose inclination as well as interest it is to encourage the latter. And it ought to be observed, that those great and excellent persons we see at the head of affairs, are of the Qu[een]'s own personal voluntary choice; not forced upon her by any insolent, overgrown favourite, or by the pretended necessity of complying with an unruly faction.

Yet these are the persons whom those scandals to the press, in their daily pamphlets and papers, openly revile at so ignominious a rate, as I believe was never tolerated before under any government. For surely no lawful power derived from a prince, should be so far affronted, as to leave those who are in authority exposed to every scurrilous libeller. Because in this point I make a mighty difference between those who are *in*, and those who are *out* of power; not upon any regard to their persons, but the stations they are placed in by the sovereign. And if my distinction be right, I think I might appeal to any man, whether if a stranger were to read the invectives which are daily published against the present ministry, and the outrageous fury of the authors against me for censuring the *last;* he would not conclude the Whigs to be at this time in full possession of power and favour, and the Tories entirely at mercy? But all this now ceases to be a wonder, since the Qu[een] herself is no longer spared; witness the libel published some days ago under the

title of "A Letter to Sir J[aco]b B[an]ks,"[1] where the reflections upon her sacred Majesty are much more plain and direct, than ever the "Examiner" thought fit to publish against the most obnoxious persons in a m[inistr]y, discarded for endeavouring the ruin of their prince and country. Cæsar indeed threatened to hang the pirates for presuming to disturb him while he was their prisoner aboard their ship.[2] But it was Cæsar who did so, and he did it to a crew of public robbers; and it became the greatness of his spirit, for he lived to execute what he had threatened. Had *they* been in his power, and sent such a message, it could be imputed to nothing but the extremes of impudence, folly or madness.

I had a letter last week relating to Mr. Greenshields[3] an Episcopal clergyman of Scotland, and the writer seems to be a gentleman of that part of Britain. I remember formerly to have read a printed account of Mr. Greenshields's case, who has been prosecuted and silenced for no other reason

[1] In his letter to the Earl of Peterborough, dated February, 171½ (Scott, vol. xv., pp. 422-3), Swift speaks more favourably of this pamphlet. His remarks to the Earl throw considerable light on Swift's own position as a Tory: "The piece is shrewdly written; and, in my opinion, not to be answered, otherwise than by disclaiming that sort of passive obedience which the Tories are charged with. This dispute would soon be ended, if the dunces who write on each side would plainly tell us what the object of this passive obedience is in our country; for I dare swear nine in ten of the Whigs will allow it to be the legislature, and as many of the Tories deny it to the prince alone; and I hardly ever saw a Whig and a Tory together, whom I could not immediately reconcile on that article when I made them explain themselves."

The pamphlet was written by a Mr. Benson in reply to Sir Jacob Banks, who, as member for Minehead, had, in 1709-10 presented an address from his constituents in which it was pretty broadly avowed that subjects must obey their monarch, since he was responsible to God alone. The writer of the letter institutes a clever parallel between England and Sweden. See note to No. 14, *ante*, and No. 34, *post*, pp. 75 and 216. [T. S.]

[2] Julius Cæsar was captured by pirates off the coast of Miletus (*c.* 75 B.C.) and held to ransom. The threat of crucifixion he then held out to his captors he afterwards fulfilled. [T. S.]

[3] The Rev. James Greenshields was imprisoned (September 15th, 1709) for conducting in Edinburgh the service according to the English Prayer Book. He appealed to the House of Lords, and the judgment against him was reversed, March 1st, 171½ ("Journals of House of Lords," xix). [T. S.]

beside reading divine service, after the manner of the Church of England, to his own congregation, who desired it: though, as the gentleman who writes to me says, there is no law in Scotland against those meetings; and he adds, that the sentence pronounced against Mr. Greenshields, "will soon be affirmed, if some care be not taken to prevent it." I am altogether uninformed in the particulars of this case, and besides to treat it justly, would not come within the compass of my paper; therefore I could wish the gentleman would undertake it in a discourse by itself; and I should be glad he would inform the public in one fact, whether Episcopal assemblies are freely allowed in Scotland? It is notorious that abundance of their clergy fled from thence some years ago into England and Ireland, as from a persecution; but it was alleged by their enemies, that they refused to take the oaths to the government, which however none of them scrupled when they came among us. It is somewhat extraordinary to see our Whigs and fanatics keep such a stir about the sacred Act of Toleration, while their brethren will not allow a connivance in so near a neighbourhood; especially if what the gentleman insists on in his letter be true, that nine parts in ten of the nobility and gentry, and two in three of the commons, be Episcopal; of which one argument he offers, is the present choice of their representatives in both Houses, though opposed to the utmost by the preachings, threatenings and anathemas of the kirk. Such usage to a majority, may, as he thinks, be of dangerous consequence; and I entirely agree with him. If these be the principles of high kirk, God preserve at least the southern parts from their tyranny!

NUMB. 32.[1]

FROM THURSDAY MARCH 1, TO THURSDAY MARCH 8. 1710-11.

——— *Garrit aniles*
Ex re fabellas.[2]

I HAD last week sent me by an unknown hand, a passage out of Plato,[3] with some hints how to apply it. That author puts a fable into the mouth of Aristophanes, with an account of the original of love. That, mankind was at first created with four arms and legs, and all other parts double to what they are now; till Jupiter, as a punishment for his sins, cleft him in two with a thunderbolt, since which time we are always looking for our *other half;* and this is the cause of love. But Jupiter threatened, that if they did not mend their manners, he would give them t'other slit, and leave them to hop about in the shape of figures in *basso relievo.* The effect of this last threatening, my correspondent imagines, is now come to pass; and that as the first splitting was the original of love, by inclining us to search for our t'other half, so the second was the cause of hatred, by prompting us to fly from our other side, and dividing the same body into two, gave each slice the name of a party.

I approve the fable and application, with this refinement upon it. For parties do not only split a nation, but every individual among them, leaving each but half their strength, and wit, and honesty, and good nature; but one eye and ear for their sight and hearing, and equally lopping

[1] No. 31 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Horace, "Satires," II. vi. 77-8.

"To club his part in pithy tales."—P. FRANCIS. [T. S.]

[3] The "Symposium," 189-192. [T. S.]

the rest of the senses: Where parties are pretty equal in a state, no man can perceive one bad quality in his own, or good one in his adversaries. Besides, party being a dry disagreeable subject, it renders conversation insipid or sour, and confines invention. I speak not here of the leaders, but the insignificant crowd of followers in a party, who have been the instruments of mixing it in every condition and circumstance of life. As the zealots among the Jews bound the law about their foreheads, and wrists, and hems of their garments; so the women among us have got the distinguishing marks of party in their muffs, their fans, and their furbelows. The Whig ladies put on their patches in a different manner from the Tories.[1] They have made schisms in the playhouse, and each have their particular sides at the opera: and when a man changes his party, he must infallibly count upon the loss of his mistress. I asked a gentleman the other day, how he liked such a lady? but he would not give me his opinion till I had answered him whether she were a Whig or a Tory. Mr.——[2] since he is known to visit the present m[inist]ry, and lay some time under a suspicion of writing the "Examiner," is no longer a man of wit; his very poems have contracted a stupidity many years after they were printed.

Having lately ventured upon a metaphorical genealogy of Merit, I thought it would be proper to add another of Party, or rather, of Faction, (to avoid mistake) not telling the reader whether it be my own or a quotation, till I know how it is approved; but whether I read or dreamed it, the fable is as follows.

"*Liberty, the daughter of Oppression, after having brought forth several fair children, as Riches, Arts, Learning, Trade, and many others, was at last delivered of her youngest daughter, called Faction; whom Juno, doing the office of the midwife, distorted in its birth, out of envy to the mother, from whence it derived its peevishness and sickly constitution. However, as it is often the nature of parents to grow most fond of their youngest and disagreeablest children, so it happened with*

[1] See "The Spectator," No. 81 (June 2nd, 1711): "Their patches were placed in those different situations, as party signals to distinguish friends from foes." [T. S.]

[2] Matthew Prior. [T. S.]

Liberty, who doted on this daughter to such a degree, that by her good will she would never suffer the girl to be out of her sight. As Miss Faction grew up, she became so termagant and froward, that there was no enduring her any longer in Heaven. Jupiter gave her warning to be gone; and her mother rather than forsake her, took the whole family down to earth. She landed at first in Greece, was expelled by degrees through all the Cities by her daughter's ill-conduct; fled afterwards to Italy, and being banished thence, took shelter among the Goths, with whom she passed into most parts of Europe; but driven out every where, she began to lose esteem, and her daughter's faults were imputed to herself. So that at this time, she has hardly a place in the world to retire to. One would wonder what strange qualities this daughter must possess, sufficient to blast the influence of so divine a mother, and the rest of her children: She always affected to keep mean and scandalous company; valuing nobody, but just as they agreed with her in every capricious opinion she thought fit to take up; and rigorously exacting compliance, though she changed her sentiments ever so often. Her great employment was to breed discord among friends and relations, and make up monstrous alliances between those whose dispositions least resembled each other. Whoever offered to contradict her, though in the most insignificant trifle, she would be sure to distinguish by some ignominious appellation, and allow them to have neither honour, wit, beauty, learning, honesty or common sense. She intruded into all companies at the most unseasonable times, mixed at balls, assemblies, and other parties of pleasure; haunted every coffee-house and bookseller's shop, and by her perpetual talking filled all places with disturbance and confusion. She buzzed about the merchant in the Exchange, the divine in his pulpit, and the shopkeeper behind his counter. Above all, she frequented public assemblies, where she sat in the shape of an obscene, ominous bird, ready to prompt her friends as they spoke."

If I understand this fable of Faction right, it ought to be applied to those who set themselves up against the true interest and constitution of their country; which I wish the undertakers for the late m[inistr]y would please to take notice of; or tell us by what figure of speech they pretend to call so great and *unforced* a majority, with the Qu[een] at

the head, by the name of "the Faction": which is not unlike the phrase of the Nonjurors, who dignifying one or two deprived bishops, and half a score clergymen of the same stamp, with the title of the "Church of England," exclude all the rest as schismatics; or like the Presbyterians, laying the same accusation, with equal justice, against the established religion.

And here it may be worth inquiring what are the true characteristics of a faction, or how it is to be distinguished from that great body of the people who are friends to the constitution? The heads of a faction, are usually a set of upstarts, or men ruined in their fortunes, whom some great change in a government, did at first, out of their obscurity, produce upon the stage. They associate themselves with those who dislike the old establishment, religious and civil. They are full of new schemes in politics and divinity; they have an incurable hatred against the old nobility, and strengthen their party by dependants raised from the lowest of the people; they have several ways of working themselves into power; but they are sure to be called when a corrupt administration wants to be supported, against those who are endeavouring at a reformation; and they firmly observe that celebrated maxim of preserving power by the same arts it is attained. They act with the spirit of those who believe their *time is but short;* and their first care is to heap up immense riches at the public expense; in which they have two ends, beside that common one of insatiable avarice; which are, to make themselves necessary, and to keep the Commonwealth in dependence: Thus they hope to compass their design, which is, instead of fitting their principles to the constitution, to alter and adjust the constitution to their own pernicious principles.

It is easy determining by this test, to which side the name of faction most properly belongs. But however, I will give them any system of law or regal government, from William the Conqueror to this present time, to try whether they can tally it with their late models; excepting only that of Cromwell, whom perhaps they will reckon for a monarch.

If the present ministry, and so great a majority in the Parliament and Kingdom, be only a faction, it must appear by some actions which answers the idea we usually conceive

from that word. Have they abused the prerogatives of the prince, or invaded the rights and liberties of the subject? Have they offered at any dangerous innovations in Church or State? Have they broached any doctrines of heresy, rebellion or tyranny? Have any of them treated their sovereign with insolence, engrossed and sold all her favours, or deceived her by base, gross misrepresentations of her most faithful servants? These are the arts of a faction, and whoever has practised them, they and their followers must take up with the name.

It is usually reckoned a Whig principle to appeal to the people; but that is only when they have been so wise as to poison their understandings beforehand: Will they now stand to this appeal, and be determined by their *vox populi*, to which side their title of faction belongs? And that the people are now left to the natural freedom of their understanding and choice, I believe our adversaries will hardly deny. They will now refuse this appeal, and it is reasonable they should; and I will further add, that if our people resembled the old Grecians, there might be danger in such a trial. A pragmatical orator told a great man at Athens, that whenever the people were in their rage, they would certainly tear him to pieces; "Yes," says the other, "and they will do the same to you, whenever they are in their wits." But God be thanked, our populace is more merciful in their nature, and at present under better direction; and the orators among us have attempted to confound both prerogative and law, in their sovereign's presence, and before the highest court of judicature, without any hazard to their persons.

NUMB. 33.[1]

FROM THURSDAY MARCH 8, TO THURSDAY MARCH 15. 1710-11.[2]

Non ea est medicina, cum sanae parti corporis scalpellum adhibetur, atque integrae; carnificina est ista, et crudelitas. Hi medentur Reipublicae qui exsecant pestem aliquam, tanquam strumam Civitatis.[3]

I AM diverted from the general subject of my discourses, to reflect upon an event of a very extraordinary and surprising nature: A great minister, in high confidence with the Queen, under whose management the weight of affairs at present is in a great measure supposed to lie; sitting in

[1] No 32 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] To this number the writer of "The Political State of Great Britain" made a pretty tart reply. In the issue for April, 1711, pp. 315-320 he says: "One of the Tory writers, shall I call him? or rather libellers—one who presumptuously sets up for an Examiner—who, in order, as he fondly expects, to make his court to some men in power, with equal insolence and malice, makes it his weekly business to slander the moderate party; who, without the least provocation, brandishes his virulent pen against the best men . . . instances in the murders of Cæsar, Henry III. and Henry IV. of France, and of the Duke of Buckingham; and having extenuated the last, 'from the motives Felton is said to have had,' he concludes," etc. The writer further goes on to say: "As to the imputation of villanous assassinations, which the Examiner charges so home on the French nation, I am heartily sorry he has given them so fair an opportunity to retort the unfair and unjust argument from particulars to generals. For, without mentioning Felton, whose crime this writer has endeavoured *to extenuate*, no foreign records can afford a greater number of murders, parricides, and, to use the Examiner's expression, solid villanies, than our English history." Swift retorted on this writer in No. 42, *post*, pp. 276, 277. [T. S.]

[3] Cicero, "Pro Sestio," 65. "But that is not a remedy when the knife is applied to some sound and healthy part of the body; that is the act of an executioner and mere inhumanity. Those are the men who really apply healing remedies to the republic, who cut out some pestilence as if it were a wen on the person of the state."—C. D. YONGE. [T. S.]

council, in a royal palace, with a dozen of the chief officers of the state, is stabbed at the very board,[1] in the execution of his office, by the hand of a French Papist, then under examination for high treason. The assassin redoubles his blow, to make sure work; and concluding the chancellor was dispatched, goes on with the same rage to murder a principal secretary of state: and that whole noble assembly are forced to rise, and draw their swords in their own defence, as if a wild beast had been let loose among them.

This fact hath some circumstances of aggravation not to be paralleled by any of the like kind we meet with in history. Cæsar's murder being performed in the Senate, comes nearest to the case; but that was an affair concerted by great numbers of the chief senators, who were likewise the actors in it, and not the work of a vile, single ruffian. Harry the Third of France was stabbed by an enthusiastic friar,[2] whom he suffered to approach his person, while those who attended him stood at some distance. His successor met the same fate in a coach, where neither he nor his nobles, in such a confinement, were able to defend themselves. In our own country we have, I think, but one instance of this sort, which has made any noise, I mean that of Felton, about fourscore years ago: but he took the opportunity to stab the Duke of Buckingham in passing through a dark lobby, from one room to another:[3] The blow was neither seen nor heard, and the murderer might have escaped, if his own concern and horror, as it is usual in such cases, had not betrayed him. Besides, that act of Felton will admit of some extenuation, from the motives he is said to have had: but this attempt of Guiscard seems to have outdone them all in every heightening circumstance, except the difference of persons between a king and a great minister: for I give no allowance at all to the difference of success (which however is yet uncertain and depending) nor think it the

[1] This refers to the attempted assassination of Harley and St. John by the Marquis de Guiscard. See Swift's "Memoirs Relating to that Change," etc. (vol. v., pp. 387-9 of present edition). [T. S.]

[2] Henri III. was assassinated by Jacques Clément, a Dominican friar, August 1st, 1589. Henri IV. was assassinated by François Ravaillac, May 14th, 1610. [T. S.]

[3] George Villiers, fourth Duke of Buckingham, was stabbed by Lieut. John Felton, August 23rd, 1628. [T. S.]

least alleviation to the crime, whatever it may be to the punishment.

I am sensible, it is ill arguing from particulars to generals, and that we ought not to charge upon a nation the crimes of a few desperate villains it is so unfortunate to produce: Yet at the same time it must be avowed, that the French have for these last centuries, been somewhat too liberal of their daggers, upon the persons of their greatest men; such as the Admiral de Coligny,[1] the Dukes of Guise,[2] father and son, and the two kings I last mentioned. I have sometimes wondered how a people, whose genius seems wholly turned to singing and dancing, and prating, to vanity and impertinence; who lay so much weight upon modes and gestures; whose essentialities are generally so very superficial; who are usually so serious upon trifles, and so trifling upon what is serious, have been capable of committing such solid villanies; more suitable to the gravity of a Spaniard, or silence and thoughtfulness of an Italian: unless it be, that in a nation naturally so full of themselves, and of so restless imaginations, when any of them happen to be of a morose and gloomy constitution, that huddle of confused thoughts, for want of evaporating, usually terminates in rage or despair. D'Avila[3] observes, that Jacques Clément was a sort of buffoon, whom the rest of the friars used to make sport with: but at last, giving his folly a serious turn, it ended in enthusiasm, and qualified him for that desperate act of murdering his king.

But in the Marquis de Guiscard there seems to have been a complication of ingredients for such an attempt: He had committed several enormities in France, was extremely prodigal and vicious; of a dark melancholy complexion, and cloudy countenance, such as in vulgar physiognomy is called an ill look. For the rest, his talents were very mean, having a sort of inferior cunning, but very small abilities; so that a great man of the late m[inist]ry, by whom he was

[1] Admiral de Coligny was assassinated August 23rd, 1572. [T. S.]

[2] François de Lorraine, Duc de Guise, was shot in 1563. His son and successor (Henri le Balafré) was killed December 23rd, 1588. [T. S.]

[3] Davila was the author of "Historia delle Guerre Civili di Francia" (*c.* 1630). He was assassinated in 1631. [T. S.]

invited over,[1] and with much discretion raised at first step from a profligate popish priest to a lieutenant-general, and colonel of a regiment of horse, was forced at last to drop him for shame.[2]

Had such an accident happened[3] under that m[inis]try, and to so considerable a member of it, they would have immediately charged it upon the whole body of those they are pleased to call "the faction." This would have been styled a high-church principle; the clergy would have been accused as promoters and abettors of the fact; com[mittee]s would have been sent to promise the criminal his life provided they might have liberty to direct and dictate his confession: and a black list would have been printed of all

[1] "The first thing I would beg of this libeller," asks "The Medley" (No. 25, March 19th, 1711), "is to make out what he affirms of his being 'invited over.' If he would but prove that one particular, I would forgive him all his lies past and yet to come."

Of course, Swift's extreme phrase of "invited over" referred to the fact that Guiscard had a Whig commission in the army. [T. S.]

[2] Antoine de Guiscard, at one time Abbé de la Bourlie, was born in 1658. For misconduct he was compelled, in 1703, to forsake his benefice and his country, and he undertook the cause of the Protestant Camisards in the Cevennes, in their insurrection against Louis XIV. It is known that he had been envoy to Turin, and had received a pension from Holland. On taking refuge in England he obtained a pension from the government, and by means of the influence of the Duke of Ormonde, who was his brother's friend, became a frequenter in fashionable circles. The death, however, of his friend Count Briançon seems to have deprived him of means. He fell into bad ways, became poor, and solicited a pension from the Queen, through St John whose acquaintance he had made. A pension of £500 was granted him; but this sum Harley reduced. Afraid that even this means of a livelihood would be taken from him he opened a treasonable correspondence with one Moreau, a Parisian banker. The rest of the story of this poor wretch's life may be gathered from the excellent account of the Harley-Guiscard incident given by W. Sichel in his "Bolingbroke and his Times" (pp. 308-313).

N. Luttrell has several entries in his Diary relating to Guiscard and the attempted assassination of Harley, and there is a long account of him in Boyer's "Political State" (vol. i., pp. 275-314). See also Portland MS., vol. iv., Wentworth Papers, and Swift's "Journal to Stella," and "Some Remarks," etc. (vol. v. of present edition). [T. S.]

[3] "Had such an accident . . . against the secretary." The writer of "A Letter to the Seven Lords" (1711) quotes this passage, and remarks that "The Examiner" "intended seriously to charge you all, with subornation, in order to proceed to murder." See also Swift's "Some Remarks," etc. (vol. v., pp. 29-53 of present edition). [T. S.]

those who had been ever seen in the murderer's company. But the present men in power hate and despise all such detestable arts, which they might now turn upon their adversaries with much more plausibility, than ever these did their honourable negotiations with Gregg.[1]

And here it may be worth observing how unanimous a concurrence there is between some persons once in great power, and a French Papist; both agreeing in the great end of taking away Mr. Harley's life, though differing in their methods: the first proceeding by subornation, the other by violence; wherein Guiscard seems to have the advantage, as aiming no further than his life; while the others designed to destroy at once both that and his reputation. The malice of both against this gentleman seems to have risen from the same cause, his discovering designs against the government. It was Mr. Harley who detected the treasonable correspondence of Gregg, and secured him betimes; when a certain great man who shall be nameless, had, out of the depth of his politics, sent him a caution to make his escape; which would certainly have fixed the appearance of guilt[2] upon Mr. Harley: but when that was prevented, they would have enticed the condemned criminal with promise of a pardon, to write and sign an accusation against the secretary. But to use Gregg's own expression, "His death was nothing near so ignominious, as would have been such a life that must be saved by prostituting his conscience." The same gentleman lies now stabbed by his other enemy, a Popish spy, whose treason he has discovered. God preserve the rest of her Majesty's ministers from such Protestants, and from such Papists!

I shall take occasion to hint at some particularities in this surprising fact, for the sake of those at distance, or who may

[1] See note on p. 263. Also note on p. 30 of vol. v. of present edition. [T. S.]

[2] William Gregg declared in his last confession that Mr. Harley "was not privy to my writing to France, directly nor indirectly," and he thanked God for touching his "conscience so powerfully . . . as to prevent my prostituting the same to save my life."—"William Gregg's Paper," "Published by Authority," 1708. Gregg told the Rev. Paul Lorrain "that he was profferred his life, and a great reward, if he would accuse his master" (F. Hoffman's "Secret Transactions," 1711, p. 8). [T. S.]

not be thoroughly informed.[1] The murderer confessed in Newgate, that his chief design was against Mr. Secretary St. John, who happened to change seats with Mr. Harley, for more convenience of examining the criminal:[2] and being asked what provoked him to stab the chancellor? he said, that not being able to come at the secretary, as he intended, it was some satisfaction to murder the person whom he thought Mr. St. John loved best.[3]

And here, if Mr. Harley has still any enemies left, whom his blood spilt in the public service cannot reconcile, I hope they will at least admire his magnanimity, which is a quality esteemed even in an enemy: and I think there are few greater instances of it to be found in story. After the wound was given, he was observed neither to change his countenance, nor discover any concern or disorder in his speech: he rose up, and walked along the room while he was able, with the greatest tranquillity, during the midst of the confusion. When the surgeon came, he took him aside, and desired he would inform him freely whether the wound were mortal, because in that case, he said, he had some affairs to settle, relating to his family. The blade of the penknife, broken by the violence of the blow against a rib, within a quarter of an inch of the handle, was dropt out (I know not whether from the wound, or his clothes) as the surgeon was going to dress him; he ordered it to be taken up, and wiping it himself, gave it some body to keep, saying, he thought "it now properly belonging to him." He shewed no sort of resentment, or spoke one violent word against

[1] Swift furnished Mrs. Manley with hints for her pamphlet entitled, "A True Narrative Of what pass'd at the Examination Of the Marquis De Guiscard," 1711. See note on p. 41 of vol. v. of present edition. [T. S.]

[2] "The matter was thus represented in the weekly paper called 'The Examiner'; which Mr. St. John perused before it was printed, but made no alteration in that passage." Swift's "Memoirs Relating to that Change," etc. (vol v., p. 389 of present edition). [T. S.]

[3] Guiscard could hardly have been aware of St. John's true sentiments towards Harley. In 1717 Bolingbroke, writing in his "Letter to Sir William Windham," says: "I abhorred Oxford to that degree, that I could not bear to be joined with him in any case" (edit. 1753, p. 94). And yet, when it was feared that Harley might die from his wound, St. John remarked to Swift that "he was but an ill dissembler" and Harley's life was "absolutely necessary." [T. S.]

Guiscard, but appeared all the while the least concerned of any in the company—a state of mind, which in such an exigency, nothing but innocence can give, and is truly worthy of a Christian philosopher.

If there be really so great a difference in principle between the high-flying Whigs, and the friends of France, I cannot but repeat the question, how come they to join in the destruction of the same man? Can his death be possibly for the interest of both? or have they both the same quarrel against him, that he is perpetually discovering and preventing the treacherous designs of our enemies? However it be, this great minister may now say with St. Paul, that he hath been "in perils by his own countrymen, and in perils by strangers."

In the midst of so melancholy a subject, I cannot but congratulate with our own country, that such a savage monster as the Marquis de Guiscard, is none of her production; a wretch perhaps more detestable in his own nature, than even this barbarous act has been yet able to represent him to the world. For there are good reasons to believe, from several circumstances, that he had intentions of a deeper dye, than those he happened to execute;[1] I mean such as every good subject must tremble to think on. He hath of late been frequently seen going up the back stairs at court, and walking alone in an outer room adjoining to her Ma[jest]y's bed-chamber. He has often and earnestly pressed for some time to have access to the Qu[een], even since his correspondence with France; and he has now given such a proof of his disposition, as leaves it easy to guess what was before in his thoughts, and what he was capable of attempting.

It is humbly to be hoped, that the legislature[2] will interpose on so extraordinary an occasion as this, and direct

[1] "It was thought he had a design against the Queen's person, for he had tried by all the ways that he could contrive to be admitted to speak with her in private." (BURNET'S "Own Times," ii., 566). [T. S.]

[2] An Act to make an Attempt on the Life of a Privy Councillor in the Execution of his Office to be Felony without Benefit of Clergy (9 Ann. c. 21). This Act, which indemnified all those who had caused Guiscard's death, was recommended in a Royal Message, March 14th, introduced April 5th, passed the House of Commons, April 19th, and received the Royal Assent, May 16th, 1711. [T. S.]

a punishment[1] some way proportionable to so execrable a crime.

Et quicunque tuum violavit vulnere corpus,
Morte luat merita ———[2]

---

[1] Writing to Stella, under date March 15th, Swift says: "I am sorry he [Guiscard] is dying; for they had found out a way to hang him. He certainly had an intention to murder the Queen." Two days later he says: "The coroner's inquest have found that he was killed by bruises received from a messenger, so to clear the cabinet counsellors from whom he received his wounds." (Vol. ii., p. 139 of present edition.) [T. S.]

[2] "He who profaned thy body by a wound
Must pay the penalty of death."
[T. S.]

NUMB. 34.[1]

FROM THURSDAY MARCH 15, TO THURSDAY MARCH 22. 1710-11.

De Libertate retinenda, qua certe nihil est dulcius, tibi assentior.[2]

THE apologies of the ancient Fathers are reckoned to have been the most useful parts of their writings, and to have done greatest service to the Christian religion, because they removed those misrepresentations which had done it most injury. The methods these writers took, was openly and freely to discover every point of their faith, to detect the falsehood of their accusers, and to charge nothing upon their adversaries but what they were sure to make good. This example has been ill followed of later times; the Papists since the Reformation using all arts to palliate the absurdities of their tenets, and loading the Reformers with a thousand calumnies; the consequence of which has been only a more various, wide, and inveterate separation. It is the same thing in civil schisms: a Whig forms an image of a Tory, just after the thing he most abhors, and that image serves to represent the whole body.

I am not sensible of any material difference there is between those who call themselves the Old Whigs, and a great majority of the present Tories; at least by all I could ever find, from examining several persons of each denomination. But it must be confessed that the present body of Whigs, as they now constitute that party, is a very odd mixture of mankind, being forced to enlarge their bottom

[1] No. 33 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Cicero, "Ep. ad Att.," xv. 13. "As to the maintenance of liberty —surely the most precious thing in the world—I agree with you."—E. S. SHUCKBURGH.

by taking in every heterodox professor either in religion or government, whose opinions they were obliged to encourage for fear of lessening their number; while the bulk of the landed men and people were entirely of the old sentiments. However, they still pretended a due regard to the monarchy and the Church, even at the time when they were making the largest steps towards the ruin of both: but not being able to wipe off the many accusations laid to their charge, they endeavoured, by throwing of scandal, to make the Tories appear blacker than themselves, that so the people might join with *them*, as the smaller evil of the two.

But among all the reproaches which the Whigs have flung upon their adversaries, there is none hath done them more service than that of *passive obedience*, as they represent it, with the consequences of non-resistance, arbitrary power, indefeasible right, tyranny, popery, and what not? There is no accusation which has passed with more plausibility than this, nor any that is supported with less justice. In order therefore to undeceive those who have been misled by false representations, I thought it would be no improper undertaking to set this matter in a fair light, which I think has not yet been done. A Whig asks whether you hold passive obedience? you affirm it: he then immediately cries out, "You are a Jacobite, a friend of France and the Pretender;" because he makes you answerable for the definition he has formed of that term, however different it be from what you understand. I will therefore give two descriptions of passive obedience; the first as it is falsely charged by the Whigs; the other as it is really professed by the Tories, at least by nineteen in twenty of all I ever conversed with.

Passive Obedience as charged by the Whigs.

The doctrine of passive obedience is to believe that a king, even in a limited monarchy, holding his power only from God, is only answerable to Him. That such a king is above all law, that the cruellest tyrant must be submitted to in all things; and if his commands be ever so unlawful, you must neither fly nor resist, nor use any other weapons than prayers and tears. Though he should force your wife or daughter,

murder your children before your face, or cut off five hundred heads in a morning for his diversion, you are still to wish him a long prosperous reign, and to be patient under all his cruelties, with the same resignation as under a plague or a famine; because to resist him would be to resist God in the person of His vicegerent. If a king of England should go through the streets of London, in order to murder every man he met, passive obedience commands them to submit. All laws made to limit him signify nothing, though passed by his own consent, if he thinks fit to break them. God will indeed call him to a severe account, but the whole people, united to a man, cannot presume to hold his hands, or offer him the least active disobedience. The people were certainly created for him, and not he for the people. His next heir, though worse than what I have described, though a fool or a madman, has a divine undefeasible right to succeed him, which no law can disannul; nay though he should kill his father upon the throne, he is immediately king to all intents and purposes, the possession of the crown wiping off all stains. But whosoever sits on the throne without this title, though never so peaceably, and by consent of former kings and parliaments, is an usurper, while there is any where in the world another person who hath a nearer hereditary right, and the whole kingdom lies under mortal sin till that heir be restored; because he has a divine title which no human law can defeat.

This and a great deal more hath, in a thousand papers[1] and pamphlets, been laid to that doctrine of passive obedience, which the Whigs are pleased to charge upon us. This is what they perpetually are instilling into the people to believe, as the undoubted principles by which the present ministry, and a great majority in Parliament, do at this time proceed. This is what they accuse the clergy of delivering

[1] The following pamphlets may be instanced:—"Julian the Apostate," [by S. Johnson], 1682; "[Passive Obedience] A Sermon preached before the . . . Lord Mayor," etc., by B. Calamy, 1683; "Passive Obedience Stated and Asserted," by T. Pomfret, 1683; "The Doctrine of Non-Resistance," [by E. Bohun], 1689; "History of Passive Obedience," [by A. Seller], 1689; "A Discourse concerning the Unreasonableness," etc. [by E. Stillingfleet], 1689; "Christianity, a Doctrine of the Cross," [by J. Kettlewell], 1691; and "The Measures of Submission," by B. Hoadly, 1706. [T. S.]

from the pulpits, and of preaching up as doctrines absolutely necessary to salvation. And whoever affirms in general, that passive obedience is due to the supreme power, he is presently loaden by our candid adversaries with such consequences as these. Let us therefore see what this doctrine is, when stripped of such misrepresentations, by describing it as really taught and practised by the Tories, and then it will appear what grounds our adversaries have to accuse us upon this article.

Passive Obedience, as professed and practised by the Tories.

They think that in every government, whether monarchy or republic, there is placed a supreme, absolute, unlimited power, to which passive obedience is due. That wherever is entrusted the power of making laws, that power is without all bounds, can repeal or enact at pleasure whatever laws it thinks fit, and justly demands universal obedience and non-resistance. That among us, as every body knows, this power is lodged in the king or queen, together with the lords and commons of the kingdom; and therefore all decrees whatsoever, made by that power, are to be actively or passively obeyed. That the administration or executive part of this power is in England solely entrusted with the prince, who in administering those laws, ought to be no more resisted than the legislative power itself. But they do not conceive the same absolute passive obedience to be due to a limited prince's commands, when they are directly contrary to the laws he has consented to, and sworn to maintain. The crown may be sued as well as a private person; and if an arbitrary king of England should send his officers to seize my lands or goods against law, I can lawfully resist them. The ministers by whom he acts are liable to prosecution and impeachment, though his own person be sacred. But if he interposes his royal authority to support their insolence, I see no remedy, till it grows a general grievance, or till the body of the people have reason to apprehend it will be so; after which it becomes a case of necessity, and then I suppose a free people may assert their own rights, yet without any violation to the person or lawful power of the prince. But although the Tories allow all this, and did justify it by the share they had in the Revolu-

tion, yet they see no reason for entering upon so ungrateful a subject, or raising controversies upon it, as if we were in daily apprehensions of tyranny, under the reign of so excellent a princess, and while we have so many laws[1] *of late years made to limit the prerogative; when according to the judgment of those who know our constitution best, things rather seem to lean to the other extreme, which is equally to be avoided. As to the succession; the Tories think an hereditary right to be the best in its own nature, and most agreeable to our old constitution; yet at the same time they allow it to be defeasible by Act of Parliament, and so is* Magna Charta *too, if the legislature thinks fit; which is a truth so manifest, that no man who understands the nature of government, can be in doubt concerning it.*

These I take to be the sentiments of a great majority among the Tories, with respect to passive obedience: and if the Whigs insist, from the writings or common talk of warm and ignorant men, to form a judgment of the whole body, according to the first account I have here given, I will engage to produce as many of their side, who are utterly against passive obedience even to the legislature; who will assert the last resort of power to be in the people, against those whom they have chosen and trusted as their representatives, with the prince at the head; and who will put wild improbable cases to shew the reasonableness and necessity of resisting the legislative power, in such imaginary junctures. Than which however nothing can be more idle; for I dare undertake in any system of government, either speculative or practic, that was ever yet in the world, from Plato's "Republic" to Harrington's "Oceana,"[2] to put such difficulties as cannot be answered.

All the other calumnies raised by the Whigs may be as easily wiped off; and I have charity to wish they could as fully answer the just accusations we have against them. Dodwell,

[1] The Act declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject (1 Will. and Mary, Sess. 2, c. 2), and the Act for the Further Limitation of the Crown (12 and 13 Will. III. c. 2), limited the power of the Crown in various respects. [T. S.]

[2] "The Commonwealth of Oceana," by James Harrington, 1656. [T. S.]

Hicks, and Lesley,[1] are gravely quoted, to prove that the Tories design to bring in the Pretender; and if I should quote them to prove that the same thing is intended by the Whigs, it would be full as reasonable, since I am sure they have at least as much to do with Nonjurors as we. But our objections against the Whigs are built upon their constant practice for many years, whereof I have produced a hundred instances, against any single one of which no answer hath yet been attempted, though I have been curious enough to look into all the papers I could meet with that are writ against the "Examiner"; such a task as I hope no man thinks I would undergo for any other end, but that of finding an opportunity to own and rectify my mistakes; as I would be ready to do upon call of the meanest adversary. Upon which occasion, I shall take leave to add a few words.

I flattered myself last Thursday, from the nature of my subject, and the inoffensive manner I handled it, that I should have one week's respite from those merciless pens, whose severity will some time break my heart; but I am deceived, and find them more violent than ever. They charge me with two lies and a blunder. The first lie is a truth, that Guiscard was invited over:[2] but it is of no consequence; I do not tax it as a fault; such sort of men have often been serviceable: I only blamed the indiscretion of raising a profligate abbot, at the first step, to a lieutenant-general and colonel of a regiment of horse, without staying some reasonable time, as is usual in such cases, till he had given some proofs of his fidelity, as well as of that interest and credit he pretended to have in his country: But that is said to be another lie, for he was a Papist, and could not have a regiment. However this other lie is a truth too; for

[1] Henry Dodwell (1641-1711), non-juror, and author of "An Admonitory Discourse . . . Schism" (1704), "Occasional Communion" (1705), etc.

George Hickes (1642-1715), non-juror, Dean of Worcester (1683-91), and author of "The Pretences of the Prince of Wales Examined, and Rejected" (1701).

Charles Leslie, see No. 16, *ante*, and note, p. 85. [T. S.]

[2] "Such a vile slanderer is the 'Examiner,' who says: 'he was invited over by the late ministry, preferred to a regiment, and made lieut.-general,' when there is an Act of Parliament against Papists being so." —"The Medley," No. 25 (March 19th). [T. S.]

a regiment he had, and paid by us, to his agent Monsieur Le Bas, for his use. The third is a blunder, that I say Guiscard's design was against Mr. Secretary St. John, and yet my reasonings upon it, are, as if it were personal against Mr. Harley. But I say no such thing, and my reasonings are just; I relate only what Guiscard said in Newgate, because it was a particularity the reader might be curious to know (and accordingly it lies in a paragraph by itself, after my reflections)[1] but I never meant to be answerable for what Guiscard said, or thought it of weight enough for me to draw conclusions from thence, when I had the Address of both Houses to direct me better; where it is expressly said,[2] "That Mr. Harley's fidelity to her Majesty, and zeal for her service, have drawn upon him the hatred of all the abettors of Popery and faction."[3] This is what I believe, and what I shall stick to.

But alas, these are not the passages which have raised so much fury against me. One or two mistakes in facts of no importance, or a single blunder, would not have provoked them; they are not so tender of my reputation as a writer. All their outrage is occasioned by those passages in that paper, which they do not in the least pretend to answer, and with the utmost reluctancy are forced to mention. They take abundance of pains to clear Guiscard from a design against Mr. Harley's life, but offer not one argument to clear their other friends, who in the business of Gregg, were equally guilty of the same design against the same person; whose tongues were very swords, and whose penknives were axes.

[1] See No. 33, *ante*, p. 212. [T. S.]

[2] This is fairly quoted, changing the person. See Swift's remarks in the following number. [T. S.]

[3] "A Letter to the Seven Lords" says: "The Examiner knows *you* are as much intended by 'faction,' as Guiscard was by 'Popery.'" [T. S.]

NUMB. 35.[1]

FROM THURSDAY MARCH 22, TO THURSDAY MARCH 29. 1711.

—Sunt hic etiam sua praemia laudi;
Sunt lacrimae rerum, et mentem mortalia tangunt.[2]

I BEGIN to be heartily weary of my employment as *Examiner;* which I wish the m[inist]ry would consider, with half so much concern as I do, and assign me some other with less pains, and a larger pension. There may soon be a vacancy, either on the bench, in the revenue, or the army, and I am *equally* qualified for each: but this trade of *Examining*, I apprehend may at one time or other go near to sour my temper. I did lately propose that some of those ingenious pens, which are engaged on the other side, might be employed to succeed me, and I undertook to bring them over for *t'other crown;* but it was answered, that those gentlemen do much better service in the stations where they are. It was added, that abundance of abuses yet remained to be laid open to the world, which I had often promised to do, but was too much diverted by other subjects that came into my head. On the other side, the advice of some friends, and the threats of many enemies, have put me upon considering what would become of me if *times should alter.* This I have done very maturely, and the result is, that I am in no manner of pain. I grant, that what I have said upon occasion, concerning the late men in

[1] No. 34 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Virgil, "Aeneid," i. 461-2. "Even here
Has merit its reward. Woe wakens tears,
And mortal sufferings touch the heart of man."—R. KENNEDY. [T. S.]

power, may be called satire by some unthinking people, as long as that faction is down; but if ever they come into play again, I must give them warning beforehand, that I shall expect to be a favourite, and that those pretended advocates of theirs, will be pilloried for libellers. For I appeal to any man, whether I ever charged that party, or its leaders, with one single action or design, which (if we may judge by their former practices) they will not openly profess, be proud of, and score up for merit, when they come again to the head of affairs? I said, they were insolent to the Qu[een]; will they not value themselves upon that, as an argument to prove them bold assertors of the people's liberty? I affirmed they were against a peace; will they be angry with me for setting forth the refinements of their politics, in pursuing the *only* method left to preserve them in power? I said, they had involved the nation in debts, and engrossed much of its money; they go beyond me, and boast they have got it all, and the credit too. I have urged the probability of their intending great alterations in religion and government: if they destroy both at their next coming, will they not reckon my foretelling it, rather as a panegyric than an affront? I said,[1] they had formerly a design against Mr. H[arle]y's life: if they were now in power, would they not immediately cut off his head, and thank me for justifying the sincerity of their intentions? In short, there is nothing I ever said of those worthy patriots, which may not be as well excused; therefore, as soon as they resume their places, I positively design to put in my claim; and, I think, may do it with much better grace, than many of that party who now make their court to the present m[inist]ry. I know two or three great men, at whose levees you may daily observe a score of the most forward faces, which every body is ashamed of, except those that wear them. But I conceive my pretensions will be upon a very different foot: Let me offer a parallel case. Suppose, King Charles the First had entirely subdued the rebels at Naseby, and reduced the kingdom to his obedience: whoever had gone about to reason, from the former conduct of those *saints*, that if the victory had fallen on their side, they would have murdered

[1] See No. 33, *ante*, p. 211. [T. S.]

their prince, destroyed monarchy and the Church and made the king's party compound for their estates as delinquents; would have been called a false, uncharitable libeller, by those very persons who afterwards gloried in all this, and called it the "work of the Lord," when they happened to succeed. I remember there was a person fined and imprisoned for *scandalum magnatum*, because he said the Duke of York was a Papist; but when that prince came to be king, and made open profession of his religion, he had the justice immediately to release his prisoner, who in his opinion had put a compliment upon him, and not a reproach: and therefore Colonel Titus,[1] who had warmly asserted the same thing in Parliament, was made a privy-councillor.

By this rule, if that which, for some politic reasons, is now called scandal upon the late m[inist]ry, proves one day to be only an abstract of such a character as they will assume and be proud of; I think I may fairly offer my pretensions, and hope for their favour. And I am the more confirmed in this notion by what I have observed in those papers, that come weekly out against the "Examiner." The authors are perpetually telling me of my ingratitude to my masters, that I blunder, and betray the cause; and write with more bitterness against those that hire me, than against the Whigs. Now I took all this at first only for so many strains of wit, and pretty paradoxes to divert the reader; but upon further thinking I find they are serious. I imagined I had complimented the present ministry for their dutiful behaviour to the Queen; for their love of the old constitution in Church and State; for their generosity and justice, and for their desire of a speedy, honourable peace: but it seems I am mistaken, and they reckon all this for satire, because it is directly contrary to the practice of all those whom they set up to defend, and utterly against all their notions of a good ministry. Therefore I cannot but

[1] Silas Titus (1622-1704) was the author of "Killing no Murder," published in 1657. He sat in Parliament successively for Ludgershall, Lostwithiel, Hertfordshire, Huntingdonshire, and Ludlow. In 1688 he was made a privy councillor. In his notes on Burnet Swift says: "Titus was the greatest rogue in England" (Burnet's "Own Times," i. 11). [T. S.]

think they have reason on their side: for suppose I should write the character of an honest, a religious, and a learned man; and send the first to Newgate, the second to the Grecian Coffee-house, and the last to White's;[1] would they not all pass for satires, and justly enough, among the companies to whom they were sent?

Having therefore employed several papers in such sort of panegyrics, and but very few on what they understand to be satires; I shall henceforth upon occasion be more liberal of the latter, of which they are like to have a taste, in the remainder of this present paper.

Among all the advantages which the kingdom hath received by the late change of ministry, the greatest must be allowed to be the calling of the present Parliament, upon the dissolution of the last. It is acknowledged, that this excellent assembly hath entirely recovered the honour of P[arliamen]ts, which had been unhappily prostituted for some years past by the factious proceedings of an unnatural majority, in concert with a most corrupt administration. It is plain, by the present choice of members, that the electors of England, when left to themselves, do rightly understand their true interest. The moderate Whigs begin to be convinced that we have been all this while in wrong hands, and that things are now as they should be. And as the present House of Commons is the best representative of the nation that hath ever been summoned in our memories; so they have taken care in their first session, by that noble Bill of Qualification,[2] that future Parliaments should be composed of landed men, and our properties lie no more at mercy of those who have none themselves, or at least only what is transient or imaginary. If there be any gratitude in posterity, the memory of this assembly will be always celebrated; if otherwise, at least we, who share in the blessings they derive to us, ought with grateful hearts to acknowledge them.

[1] For the signification of these coffee-houses see the remarks prefixed to the "Tatlers" in this volume, p. 4. [T. S.]

[2] An Act for Securing the Freedom of Parliaments (9 Ann. c. 5) provided that English members should show a land qualification. It was introduced December 13th, 1710, and received the Royal Assent, February 28th. See also No. 45, *post*, p. 294. [T. S.]

I design, in some following papers, to draw up a list (for I can do no more) of the great things this Parliament hath already performed, the many abuses they have detected; their justice in deciding elections without regard of party; their cheerfulness and address in raising supplies for the war, and at the same time providing for the nation's debts; their duty to the Queen, and their kindness to the Church. In the mean time I cannot forbear mentioning two particulars, which in my opinion do discover, in some measure, the temper of the present Parliament; and bear analogy to those passages related by Plutarch, in the lives of certain great men; which, as himself observes, "Though they be not of actions which make any great noise or figure in history, yet give more light into the characters of persons, than we could receive from an account of their most renowned achievements."

Something like this may be observed from two late instances of decency and good nature, in that illustrious assembly I am speaking of. The first was, when after that inhuman attempt upon Mr. Harley, they were pleased to vote an Address to the Queen,[1] wherein they express their utmost detestation of the fact, their high esteem and great concern for that able minister, and justly impute his misfortunes to that zeal for her Majesty's service, which had "drawn upon him the hatred of all the abettors of Popery and faction." I dare affirm, that so distinguishing a mark of honour and good will from such a Parliament, was more acceptable to a person of Mr. H[arle]y's generous nature, than the most bountiful grant that was ever yet made to a subject; as her Majesty's answer, filled with gracious expressions in his favour, adds more to his real glory, than any *titles* she could bestow. The prince and representatives of the whole kingdom, join in their concern for so important

[1] The Address to the Queen was presented on March 13th. Swift somewhat strengthens the language of the address, the original words stating that the Houses had "to our great concern been informed," etc.; and "we cannot but be most deeply affected to find such an instance of inveterate malice, against one employed in your Majesty's council," etc. The Queen, in her reply, referred to "that barbarous attempt on Mr. Harley, whose zeal and fidelity in my service must appear yet more eminently by that horrid endeavour," etc.—"Journals of House of Lords," xix.; "Journals of House of Commons," xvi. [T. S.]

a life. These are the true rewards of virtue, and this is the commerce between noble spirits, in a coin which the giver knows where to bestow, and the receiver how to value, though neither avarice nor ambition would be able to comprehend its worth.

The other instance I intended to produce of decency and good nature, in the present House of Commons, relates to their most worthy Speaker;[1] who having unfortunately lost his eldest son,[2] the assembly, moved with a generous pity for so sensible an affliction, adjourned themselves for a week, that so good a servant of the public, might have some interval to wipe away a father's tears: And indeed that gentleman has too just an occasion for his grief, by the death of a son, who had already acquired so great a reputation for every amiable quality, and who might have lived to be so great an honour and an ornament to his ancient family.

Before I conclude, I must desire one favour of the reader, that when he thinks it worth his while to peruse any paper writ against the "Examiner," he will not form his judgment by any mangled quotation out of it which he finds in such papers, but be so just to read the paragraph referred to; which I am confident will be found a sufficient answer to all that ever those papers can object. At least I have seen above fifty of them, and never yet observed one single quotation transcribed with common candour.

[1] William Bromley (1664-1732) was Speaker from 1710 till 1713. See note on p. 334 of vol. v. of present edition. [T. S.]

[2] Clobery Bromley (1688-1711) was elected M.P. for Coventry, December, 1710. Only a few days before his death he had been appointed one of the commissioners to examine the public accounts. "The House being informed [March 20th] that Clobery Bromley, Esq., son to the Speaker, died that morning; out of respect to the father, and to give him time, both to perform the funeral rites, and to indulge his just affliction, they thought fit to adjourn to" the 26th.—"Hist. and Proc. of House of Commons," iv. 199.

Swift wrote to Stella on the matter under date March 20th, 1711: "The Speaker's eldest son is just dead of the small pox, and the House is adjourned a week, to give him time to wipe off his tears. I think it very handsomely done; but I believe one reason is, that they want Mr. Harley so much" (vol. ii., p. 141 of present edition). [T. S.]

NUMB. 36.[1]

FROM THURSDAY MARCH 29, TO THURSDAY APRIL 5, 1711.

Nullo suo peccato impediantur, quo minus alterius peccata demonstrare possint.[2]

I HAVE been considering the old constitution of this kingdom, comparing it with the monarchies and republics whereof we meet so many accounts in ancient story, and with those at present in most parts of Europe: I have considered our religion, established here by the legislature soon after the Reformation: I have likewise examined the genius and disposition of the people, under that reasonable freedom they possess: Then I have turned my reflections upon those two great divisions of Whig and Tory, (which, some way or other, take in the whole kingdom) with the principles they both profess, as well as those wherewith they reproach one another. From all this, I endeavour to determine, from which side her present M[ajest]y may reasonably hope for most security to her person and government, and to which she ought, in prudence, to trust the administration of her affairs. If these two rivals were really no more than *parties*, according to the common acceptation of the word, I should agree with those politicians who think, a prince descends from his dignity by putting himself at the head of either; and that his wisest course is, to keep them in a balance; raising or depressing either as it best suited with his designs. But when the visible interest of his crown and kingdom lies on one side, and when the other is but a faction, raised and strengthened by incidents and intrigues, and by deceiving the people with false representations of

[1] No. 35 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] "None are prevented by their own faults from pointing out the faults of another."—H. T. RILEY. [T. S.]

things; he ought, in prudence, to take the first opportunity of opening his subjects' eyes, and declaring himself in favour of those, who are for preserving the civil and religious rights of the nation, wherewith his own are so interwoven.

This was certainly our case: for I do not take the heads, advocates, and followers of the Whigs, to make up, strictly speaking, a national party; being patched up of heterogeneous, inconsistent parts, whom nothing served to unite but the common interest of sharing in the spoil and plunder of the people; the present dread of their adversaries, by whom they apprehended to be called to an account, and that general conspiracy, of endeavouring to overturn the Church and State; which, however, if they could have compassed, they would certainly have fallen out among themselves, and broke in pieces, as *their predecessors* did, after they destroyed the monarchy and religion. For, how could a Whig, who is against all discipline, agree with a Presbyterian, that carries it higher than the Papists themselves? How could a Socinian adjust his models to either? Or how could any of these cement with a Deist or Freethinker, when they came to consult upon settling points of faith? Neither would they have agreed better in their systems of government, where some would have been for a king, under the limitations of a Duke of Venice; others for a Dutch republic; a third party for an aristocracy, and most of them all for some new fabric of their own contriving.

But however, let us consider them as a party, and under those general tenets wherein they agreed, and which they publicly owned, without charging them with any that they pretend to deny. Then let us *Examine* those principles of the Tories, which their adversaries allow them to profess, and do not pretend to tax them with any actions contrary to those professions: after which, let the reader judge from which of these two parties a prince hath most to fear; and whether her M[ajest]y did not consider the ease, the safety and dignity of her person, the security of her crown, and the transmission of monarchy to her Protestant successors, when she put her affairs into the present hands.

Suppose the matter were now entire; the Qu[een] to make her choice, and for that end, should order the principles on both sides to be fairly laid before her. First, I

conceive the Whigs would grant, that they have naturally no very great veneration for crowned heads; that they allow, the person of the prince may, upon many occasions, be resisted by arms; and that they do not condemn the war raised against King Charles the First, or own it to be a rebellion, though they would be thought to blame his murder. They do not think the prerogative to be yet sufficiently limited, and have therefore taken care (as a particular mark of their veneration for the illustrious house of Hanover) to clip it closer against next reign; which, consequently, they would be glad to see done in the present: not to mention, that the majority of them, if it were put to the vote, would allow, that they prefer a commonwealth before a monarchy. As to religion; their universal, undisputed maxim is, that it ought to make no distinction at all among Protestants; and in the word Protestant they include every body who is not a Papist, and who will, by an oath, give security to the government. Union in discipline and doctrine, the offensive sin of schism, the notion of a Church and a hierarchy, they laugh at as foppery, cant and priestcraft. They see no necessity at all that there should be a national faith; and what we usually call by that name, they only style the "religion of the magistrate."[1] Since the Dissenters and we agree in the main, why should the difference of a few speculative points, or modes of dress, incapacitate them from serving their prince and country, in a juncture when we ought to have all hands up against the common enemy? And why should they be forced to take the sacrament from our clergy's hands, and in our posture, or indeed why compelled to receive it at all, when they take an employment which has nothing to do with religion?

These are the notions which most of that party avow, and which they do not endeavour to disguise or set off with false colours, or complain of being misrepresented about. I have here placed them on purpose, in the same light which themselves do, in the very apologies they make for what we accuse them of; and how inviting even these doctrines are,

[1] See Swift's "Letter Concerning the Sacramental Test" (vol. iv., p. 11 of present edition). [T. S.]

for such a monarch to close with, as our law, both statute and common, understands a King of England to be, let others decide. But then, if to these we should add other opinions, which most of their own writers justify, and which their universal practice has given a sanction to, they are no more than what a prince might reasonably expect, as the natural consequence of those avowed principles. For when such persons are at the head of affairs, the low opinion they have of princes, will certainly tempt them to violate that respect they ought to bear; and at the same time, their own want of duty to their sovereign is largely made up, by exacting greater submissions to themselves from their fellow-subjects: it being indisputably true, that the same principle of pride and ambition makes a man treat his equals with insolence, in the same proportion as he affronts his superiors; as both Prince and people have sufficiently felt from the late m[inist]ry.

Then from their confessed notions of religion, as above related, I see no reason to wonder, why they countenanced not only all sorts of Dissenters, but the several gradations of freethinkers among us (all which were openly enrolled in their party); nor why they were so very averse from the present established form of worship, which by prescribing obedience to princes from the topic of conscience, would be sure to thwart all their schemes of innovation.

One thing I might add, as another acknowledged maxim in that party, and in my opinion, as dangerous to the constitution as any I have mentioned; I mean, that of preferring, on all occasions, the moneyed interest before the landed; which they were so far from denying, that they would gravely debate the reasonableness and justice of it; and at the rate they went on, might in a little time have found a majority of representatives, fitly qualified to lay those heavy burthens on the rest of the nation, which themselves would not touch with one of their fingers.

However, to deal impartially, there are some motives which might compel a prince, under the necessity of affairs, to deliver himself over to that party. They were *said* to possess the great bulk of cash, and consequently of credit in the nation, and the heads of them had the reputation of presiding over those societies who have the great direction

of both:[1] so that all applications for loans to the public service, upon any emergency, must be made through them; and it might prove highly dangerous to disoblige them, because in that case, it was not to be doubted, that they would be obstinate and malicious, ready to obstruct all affairs, not only by shutting their own purses, but by endeavouring to sink credit, though with some present imaginary loss to themselves, only to shew, it was a creature of their own.

From this summary of Whig-principles and dispositions, we find what a prince may reasonably fear and hope from that party. Let us now very briefly consider, the doctrines of the Tories, which their adversaries will not dispute. As they prefer a well-regulated monarchy before all other forms of government; so they think it next to impossible to alter that institution here, without involving our whole island in blood and desolation. They believe, that the prerogative of a sovereign ought, at least, to be held as sacred and inviolable as the rights of his people, if only for this reason, because without a due share of power, he will not be able to protect them. They think, that by many known laws of this realm, both statute and common, neither the person, nor lawful authority of the prince, ought, upon any pretence whatsoever, to be resisted or disobeyed. Their sentiments, in relation to the Church, are known enough, and will not be controverted, being just the reverse to what I have delivered as the doctrine and practice of the Whigs upon that article.

But here I must likewise deal impartially too, and add one principle as a characteristic of the Tories, which has much discouraged some princes from making use of them in affairs. Give the Whigs but power enough to insult their sovereign, engross his favours to themselves, and to oppress and plunder their fellow-subjects; they presently grow into good humour and good language towards the crown; pro-

[1] The Bank and the East India Company. The former was so decidedly in the Whig interest, that the great Doctor Sacheverell, on appearing to give his vote for choosing governors and directors for the Bank, was very rudely treated. Nor were the ministry successful in an attempt made about that time to put these great companies under Tory management. [S.] And see No. 25, *ante*, pp. 154-5. [T. S.]

fess they will stand by it with their lives and fortunes; and whatever rudenesses they may be guilty of in private, yet they assure the world, that there never was so gracious a monarch. But to the shame of the Tories, it must be confessed, that nothing of all this hath been ever observed in them; in or out of favour, you see no alteration, further than a little cheerfulness or cloud in their countenances; the highest employments can add nothing to their loyalty, but their behaviour to their prince, as well as their expressions of love and duty, are, in all conditions, exactly the same.

Having thus impartially stated the avowed principles of Whig and Tory; let the reader determine, as he pleases, to which of these two a wise prince may, with most safety to himself and the public, trust his person and his affairs; and whether it were rashness or prudence in her M[ajest]y to make those changes in the ministry, which have been so highly extolled by some, and condemned by others.

NUMB. 37.[1]

FROM THURSDAY APRIL 5, TO THURSDAY APRIL 12, 1711.

Tres species tam dissimiles, tria talia texta
Una dies dedit exitio —— [2]

I WRITE this paper for the sake of the Dissenters, whom I take to be the most spreading branch of the Whig party, that professeth Christianity, and the only one that seems to be zealous for any particular system of it; the bulk of those we call the Low Church, being generally indifferent, and undetermined in that point; and the other subdivisions having not yet taken either the Old or New Testament into their scheme. By the Dissenters therefore, it will easily be understood, that I mean the Presbyterians, as they include the sects of Anabaptists, Independents, and others, which have been melted down into them since the Restoration. This sect, in order to make itself national, having gone so far as to raise a Rebellion, murder their king, destroy monarchy and the Church, was afterwards broken in pieces by its own divisions; which made way for the king's return from his exile. However, the zealous among them did still entertain hopes of recovering the "dominion of grace;" whereof I have read a remarkable passage, in a book published about the year 1661 and written by one of their own side. As one of the regicides was going to his execution, a friend asked him, whether he thought the cause would revive? He answered, "The cause is in the bosom of Christ, and as sure as Christ rose from the dead, so sure will the cause revive also."[3] And

[1] No. 36 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] "Three different forms, of threefold threads combined,
The selfsame day in common ruin joined."
[T. S.]

[3] It is recorded in "The Speeches and Prayers of . . . Mr. John

therefore the Nonconformists were strictly watched and restrained by penal laws, during the reign of King Charles the Second; the court and kingdom looking on them as a faction, ready to join in any design against the government in Church or State: And surely this was reasonable enough, while so many continued alive, who had voted, and fought, and preached against both, and gave no proof that they had changed their principles. The Nonconformists were then exactly upon the same foot with our Nonjurors now, whom we double tax, forbid their conventicles, and keep under hatches; without thinking ourselves possessed with a persecuting spirit, because we know they want nothing but the power to ruin us. This, in my opinion, should altogether silence the Dissenters' complaints of persecution under King Charles the Second; or make them shew us wherein they differed, at that time, from what our Jacobites are now.

Their inclinations to the Church were soon discovered, when King James the Second succeeded to the crown, with whom they unanimously joined in its ruin, to revenge themselves for that restraint they had most justly suffered in the foregoing reign; not from the persecuting temper of the clergy, as their clamours would suggest, but the prudence and caution of the legislature. The same indulgence against law, was made use of by them and the Papists, and they amicably employed their power, as in defence of one common interest.

But the Revolution happening soon after, served to wash away the memory of the rebellion; upon which, the run against Popery, was, no doubt, as just and seasonable, as that of fanaticism, after the Restoration: and the dread of Popery, being then our latest danger, and consequently the most fresh upon our spirits, all mouths were open against that; the Dissenters were rewarded with an indulgence by law; the rebellion and king's murder were now no longer a reproach; the former was only a civil war, and whoever durst call it a rebellion, was a Jacobite, and friend to

Carew," 1660, and in "Rebels no Saints," 1661, that at the execution of John Carew, on October 15th, 1660: "One asked him if he thought there would be a resurrection of the cause? He answered, he died in the faith of that, as much as he did that his body should rise again." [T. S.]

France. This was the more unexpected, because the Revolution being wholly brought about by Church of England hands, they hoped one good consequence of it, would be the relieving us from the encroachments of Dissenters, as well as those of Papists, since both had equally confederated towards our ruin; and therefore, when the crown was new settled, it was hoped at least that the rest of the constitution would be restored. But this affair took a very different turn; the Dissenters had just made a shift to save a tide, and joined with the Prince of Orange, when they found all was desperate with their protector King James. And observing a party, then forming against the old principles in Church and State, under the name of Whigs and Low-Churchmen, they listed themselves of it, where they have ever since continued.

It is therefore, upon the foot they now are, that I would apply myself to them, and desire they would consider the different circumstances at present, from what they were under, when they began their designs against the Church and monarchy, about seventy years ago. At that juncture they made up the body of the party, and whosoever joined with them from principles of revenge, discontent, ambition, or love of change, were all forced to shelter under their denomination; united heartily in the pretences of a further and purer Reformation in religion, and of advancing the "great work" (as the cant was then) "that God was about to do in these nations," received the systems of doctrine and discipline prescribed by the Scots, and readily took the Covenant;[1] so that there appeared no division among them, till after the common enemy was subdued.

But now their case is quite otherwise, and I can hardly think it worth being of a party, upon the terms they have been received of late years; for suppose the whole faction should at length succeed in their design of destroying the Church; are they so weak to imagine, that the new modelling of religion, would be put into their hands? Would their brethren, the Low-Churchmen and Freethinkers, sub-

[1] The Scotch General Assembly approved the "Solemn League and Covenant" on August 17th, 1643; it was publicly taken by the House of Commons at St. Margaret's, Westminster, on September 25th. [T. S.]

mit to their discipline, their synods or their classes, and divide the lands of bishops, or deans and chapters, among them? How can they help observing that their allies, instead of pretending more sanctity than other men, are some of them for levelling all religion, and the rest for abolishing it? Is it not manifest, that they have been treated by their confederates, exactly after the same manner, as they were by King James the Second, made instruments to ruin the Church, not for their sakes, but under a pretended project of universal freedom in opinion, to advance the dark designs of those who employ them? For, excepting the anti-monarchical principle, and a few false notions about liberty, I see but little agreement betwixt them; and even in these, I believe, it would be impossible to contrive a frame of government, that would please them all, if they had it now in their power to try. But however, to be sure, the Presbyterian institution would never obtain. For, suppose they should, in imitation of their predecessors, propose to have no King but our Saviour Christ, the whole clan of Freethinkers would immediately object, and refuse His authority. Neither would their Low-Church brethren use them better, as well knowing what enemies they are to that doctrine of unlimited toleration, wherever they are suffered to preside. So that upon the whole, I do not see, as their present circumstances stand, where the Dissenters can find better quarter, than from the Church of England.

Besides, I leave it to their consideration, whether, with all their zeal against the Church, they ought not to shew a little decency, and how far it consists with their reputation, to act in concert with such confederates. It was reckoned a very infamous proceeding in the present most Christian king, to assist the Turk against the Emperor: policy, and reasons of state, were not allowed sufficient excuses, for taking part with an infidel against a believer. It is one of the Dissenters' quarrels against the Church, that she is not enough reformed from Popery; yet they boldly entered into a league with Papists and a popish prince, to destroy her. They profess much sanctity, and object against the wicked lives of some of our members; yet they have been long, and still continue, in strict combination with libertines and atheists, to contrive our ruin. What if the Jews should

multiply, and become a formidable party among us? Would the Dissenters join in alliance with them likewise, because they agree already in some general principles, and because the Jews are allowed to be a "stiffnecked and rebellious people"?

It is the part of wise men to conceal their passions, when they are not in circumstances of exerting them to purpose: the arts of getting power, and preserving indulgence, are very different. For the former, the reasonable hopes of the Dissenters, seem to be at an end; their comrades, the Whigs and Freethinkers, are just in a condition proper to be forsaken; and the Parliament, as well as the body of the people, will be deluded no longer. Besides, it sometimes happens for a cause to be exhausted and worn out, as that of the Whigs in general, seems at present to be: the nation has had enough of it. It is as vain to hope restoring that decayed interest, as for a man of sixty to talk of entering on a new scene of life, that is only proper for youth and vigour. New circumstances and new men must arise, as well as new occasions, which are not like to happen in our time. So that the Dissenters have no game left, at present, but to secure their indulgence: in order to which, I will be so bold to offer them some advice.

First, That until some late proceedings are a little forgot, they would take care not to provoke, by any violence of tongue or pen, so great a majority, as there is now against them, nor keep up any longer that combination with their broken allies, but disperse themselves, and lie dormant against some better opportunity: I have shewn, they could have got no advantage if the late party had prevailed; and they will certainly lose none by its fall, unless through their own fault. They pretend a mighty veneration for the Queen; let them give proof of it, by quitting the ruined interest of those who have used her so ill; and by a due respect to the persons she is pleased to trust at present with her affairs: When they can no longer hope to govern, when struggling can do them no good, and may possibly hurt them, what is left but to be silent and passive?

Secondly, Though there be no law (beside that of God Almighty) against *occasional conformity*,[1] it would be prudence

[1] Such a law was passed December 20th, 1711. It was entitled "An

in the Dissenters to use it as tenderly as they can: for, besides the infamous hypocrisy of the thing itself, too frequent practice would perhaps make a remedy necessary. And after all they have said to justify themselves in this point, it still continues hard to conceive, how those consciences can pretend to be scrupulous, upon which an employment has more power than the love of unity.

In the last place, I am humbly of opinion, That the Dissenters would do well to drop that lesson they have learned from their directors, of affecting to be under horrible apprehensions, that the Tories are in the interests of the Pretender, and would be ready to embrace the first opportunity of inviting him over. It is with the worst grace in the world, that they offer to join in the cry upon this article: as if those, who alone stood in the gap against all the encroachments of Popery and arbitrary power, are not more likely to keep out both, than a set of schismatics, who to gratify their ambition and revenge, did, by the meanest compliances, encourage and spirit up that unfortunate prince, to fall upon such measures, as must, at last, have ended in the ruin of our liberty and religion.

I wish those who give themselves the trouble to write to the "Examiner," would consider whether what they send be proper for such a paper to take notice of: I had one letter last week, written, as I suppose, by a divine, to desire I would offer some reasons against a Bill now before the Parliament for Ascertaining the Tithe of Hops;[1] *from which the writer apprehends great damage to the clergy, especially the poorer vicars: If it be, as he says, (and he seems to argue very reasonably upon it) the convocation now sitting, will, no doubt, upon due application, represent the matter to the House of Commons; and he may expect all justice and*

Act for preserving the Protestant Religion" (10 Ann. c. 6), and required persons appointed to various offices to conform to the Church of England for one year and to receive the Sacrament three times. [T. S.]

[1] Leave was given for a Bill for Ascertaining the Tithe of Hops, March 26th, 1711, and the Bill was presented May 10th. It does not appear to have gone any further. [T. S.]

favour from that great body, who have already appeared so tender of their rights.

A gentleman, likewise, who hath sent me several letters, relating to personal hardships he received from some of the late ministry; is advised to publish a narrative of them, they being too large, and not proper for this paper.

NUMB. 38.[1]

FROM THURSDAY APRIL 12, TO THURSDAY APRIL 19, 1711.

Semper causae eventorum magis movent quam ipsa eventa.[2]

I AM glad to observe, that several among the Whigs have begun very much to change their language of late. The style is now among the reasonable part of them, when they meet a man in business, or a Member of Parliament; "Well, gentlemen, if you go on as you have hitherto done, we shall no longer have any pretence to complain." They find, it seems, that there have been yet no overtures made to bring in the Pretender, nor any preparatory steps towards it. They read no enslaving votes, nor bills brought in to endanger the subject. The indulgence to scrupulous consciences,[3] is again confirmed from the throne, inviolably preserved, and not the least whisper offered that may affect it. All care is taken to support the war; supplies cheerfully granted, and funds readily subscribed to, in spite of the little arts made use of to discredit them. The just resentments of some, which are laudable in themselves, and which at another juncture it might be proper to give way to, have been softened or diverted by the calmness of others. So that upon the article of present management, I do not see how any objection of weight can well be raised.

However, our adversaries still allege, that this great success was wholly unexpected, and out of all probable view. That in public affairs, we ought least of all others, to judge

[1] No. 37 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Cicero, "Ep. ad Att.," ix. 5. "I am always more affected by the causes of events than by the events themselves."—E. S. SHUCKBURGH. [T. S.]

[3] "I am resolved . . . to maintain the indulgence by law allowed to scrupulous consciences" (Queen Anne's Speech, November 27th, 1710). [T. S.]

by events; that the attempt of changing a ministry, during the difficulties of a long war, was rash and inconsiderate: That if the Qu[een] were disposed by her inclinations, or from any personal dislike, for such a change, it might have been done with more safety, in a time of peace: That if it had miscarried by any of those incidents, which in all appearance might have intervened, the consequences would perhaps have ruined the whole confederacy; and, therefore, however it hath now succeeded, the experiment was too dangerous to try.

But this is what we can by no means allow them. We never will admit rashness or chance to have produced all this harmony and order. It is visible to the world, that the several steps towards this change were slowly taken, and with the utmost caution. The movers observed as they went on, how matters would bear, and advanced no farther at first, than so as they might be able to stop or go back, if circumstances were not mature. Things were grown to such a height, that it was no longer the question, whether a person who aimed at an employment, were a Whig or a Tory, much less, whether he had merit or proper abilities for what he pretended to: he must owe his preferment only to the favourites; and the crown was so far from nominating, that they would not allow it a negative. This, the Qu[een] was resolved no longer to endure, and began to break into their prescription, by bestowing one or two places of consequence,[1] without consulting her ephori; after they had fixed them for others, and concluded as usually, that all their business was to signify their pleasure to her M[ajest]y. But though the persons the Qu[een] had chosen, were such as no objection could well be raised against upon the score of party; yet the oligarchy took the alarm;[2] their sovereign authority was, it seems, called in question; they grew into anger and discontent, as if their undoubted rights were

[1] The Queen appointed Earl Rivers to the lieutenancy of the Tower without the Duke of Marlborough's concurrence. See "Memoirs Relating to that Change," etc. (vol. v., pp. 375-7 of present edition). [T. S.]

[2] "Upon the fall of that great minister and favourite [Godolphin], that whole party became dispirited, and seemed to expect the worst that could follow" (Swift's "Memoirs Relating to that Change," etc., vol. v., p. 378 of present edition). [T. S.]

violated. All former obligations to their sovereign now became cancelled; and they put themselves upon the foot of people, who were hardly used after the most eminent services.

I believe all men, who know any thing in politics, will agree, that a prince thus treated, by those he has most confided in, and perpetually loaded with his favours, ought to extricate himself as soon as possible; and is then only blamable in his choice of time, when he defers one minute after it is in his power; because, from the monstrous encroachments of exorbitant avarice and ambition, he cannot tell how long it may continue to be so. And it will be found, upon enquiring into history, that most of those princes, who have been ruined by favourites, have owed their misfortune to the neglect of early remedies; deferring to struggle till they were quite sunk.

The Whigs are every day cursing the ungovernable rage, the haughty pride, and unsatiable covetousness of a certain person,[1] as the cause of their fall; and are apt to tell their thoughts, that one single removal might have set all things right. But the interests of that single person, were found, upon experience, so complicated and woven with the rest, by love, by awe, by marriage, by alliance, that they would rather confound heaven and earth, than dissolve such an union.

I have always heard and understood, that a king of England, possessed of his people's hearts, at the head of a free Parliament, and in full agreement with a great majority, made the true figure in the world that such a monarch ought to do, and pursued the real interest of himself and his kingdom. Will they allow her M[ajest]y to be in those circumstances at present? And was it not plain by the addresses sent from all parts of the island,[2] and by the visible disposition of the people, that such a Parliament would un-

[1] The Duchess of Marlborough. [T. S.]

[2] "The bulk of the high-church, or Tory-party . . . were both very industrious in procuring addresses, which, under the pretence of expressing their loyalty to the Queen, and affection to the Church established, were mainly levelled, like so many batteries, against the ministry and Parliament," etc. (Boyer's "Annals of Queen Anne," ix. 158-9). [T. S.]

doubtedly be chosen? And so it proved, without the court's using any arts to influence elections.

What people then, are these in a corner, to whom the constitution must truckle? If the whole nation's credit cannot supply funds for the war, without humble application from the entire legislature to a few retailers of money, it is high time we should sue for a peace. What new maxims are these, which neither we nor our forefathers ever heard of before, and which no wise institution would ever allow? Must our laws from henceforward pass the Bank and East India Company, or have their royal assent before they are in force?

To hear some of those worthy reasoners talking of credit, that she is so nice, so squeamish, so capricious; you would think they were describing a lady troubled with vapours or the colick, to be only removed by a course of steel, and swallowing a bullet. By the narrowness of their thoughts, one would imagine they conceived the world to be no wider than Exchange Alley. It is probable they may have such a sickly dame among them, and it is well if she has no worse diseases, considering what hands she passes through. But the national credit is of another complexion; of sound health, and an even temper, her life and existence being a quintessence drawn from the vitals of the whole kingdom. And we find these money-politicians, after all their noise, to be of the same opinion, by the court they paid her, when she lately appeared to them in the form of a *lottery*.[1]

As to that mighty error in politics, they charge upon the Qu[een], for changing her ministry in the height of a war, I suppose, it is only looked upon as an error under a Whiggish administration; otherwise, the late King has much to answer for, who did it pretty frequently. And it is well known, that the late ministry of famous memory, was brought in during this present war,[2] only with this circumstance, that two or three of the chief, did first

[1] An Act for reviving . . . certain Duties (9 Ann., c. 6), provided that £1,500,000 should be raised "by way of a lottery." It was introduced February 15th, and received the Royal Assent March 6th, 171$\frac{0}{1}$. [T. S.]

[2] The Queen appointed a ministry with Lord Godolphin as lord treasurer in the first months of her reign, May-July, 1702. [T. S.]

change their own principles, and then took in suitable companions.

But however, I see no reason why the Tories should not value their wisdom by events, as well as the Whigs. Nothing was ever thought a more precipitate rash counsel, than that of altering the coin at the juncture it was done;[1] yet the prudence of the undertaking was sufficiently justified by the success. Perhaps it will be said, that the attempt was necessary, because the whole species of money, was so grievously clipped and counterfeit. And, is not her Majesty's authority as sacred as her coin? And has not that been most scandalously clipped and mangled, and often counterfeited too?

It is another grievous complaint of the Whigs, that their late friends, and the whole party, are treated with abundance of severity in print, and in particular by the "Examiner." They think it hard, that when they are wholly deprived of power, hated by the people, and out of all hope of re-establishing themselves, their infirmities should be so often displayed, in order to render them yet more odious to mankind. This is what they employ their writers to set forth in their papers of the week; and it is humoursome enough to observe one page taken up in railing at the "Examiner" for his invectives against a discarded ministry; and the other side filled with the falsest and vilest abuses, against those who are now in the highest power and credit with their sovereign, and whose least breath would scatter them into silence and obscurity. However, though I have indeed often wondered to see so much licentiousness taken and connived at, and am sure it would not be suffered in any other country of Christendom; yet I never once invoked the assistance of the gaol or the pillory, which upon the least provocation, was the usual style during their tyranny. There hath not passed a week these twenty years without

[1] The clipping of coin had become so widespread that it was absolutely imperative that steps should be taken to readjust matters. It was resolved, therefore, in 1695, to call in all light money and recoin it. The matter was placed in charge of the then chancellor of the exchequer, Charles Montague, afterwards Earl of Halifax, and he, with the assistance of Sir Isaac Newton, successfully accomplished the very arduous task. It cost the nation about £2,200,000, and a considerable inconvenience owing to lack of coins. [T. S.]

some malicious paper, scattered in every coffee-house by the emissaries of that party, whether it were down or up. I believe, they will not pretend to object the same thing to us. Nor do I remember any constant weekly paper, with reflections on the late ministry or j[u]nto. They have many weak, defenceless parts, they have not been used to a regular attack, and therefore it is that they are so ill able to endure one, when it comes to be their turn. So that they complain more of a few months' truths from us, than we did of all their scandal and malice, for twice as many years.

I cannot forbear observing upon this occasion, that those worthy authors I am speaking of, seem to me, not fairly to represent the sentiments of their party; who in disputing with us, do generally give up several of the late m[inist]ry, and freely own many of their failings. They confess the monstrous debt upon the navy, to have been caused by most scandalous mismanagement; they allow the insolence of some, and the avarice of others, to have been insupportable: but these gentlemen are most liberal in their praises to those persons, and upon those very articles, where their wisest friends give up the point. They gravely tell us, that such a one was the most faithful servant that ever any prince had; another the most dutiful, a third the most generous, and a fourth of the greatest integrity. So that I look upon these champions, rather as retained by a cabal than a party, which I desire the reasonable men among them would please to consider.

NUMB. 39.[1]

FROM THURSDAY APRIL 19, TO THURSDAY APRIL 26, 1711.

Indignum est in eâ civitate, quae legibus continetur, discedi a legibus.[2]

I[3] HAVE been often considering how it comes to pass, that the dexterity of mankind in evil, should always outgrow, not only the prudence and caution of private persons, but the continual expedients of the wisest laws contrived to prevent it. I cannot imagine a knave to possess a greater share of natural wit or genius, than an honest man. I have known very notable sharpers at play, who upon all other occasions, were as great dunces, as human shape can well allow; and I believe, the same might be observed among the other knots of thieves and pickpockets, about this town. The proposition however is certainly true, and to be confirmed by an hundred instances. A scrivener, an attorney,

[1] No. 38 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] "It is a shameful thing in a state which is governed by laws, that there should be any departure from them." [T. S.]

[3] This paper called forth a reply which was printed in two forms, one with the title: "A Few Words upon the Examiner's Scandalous Peace" (London, 1711), and the other, "Reflections upon the Examiner's Scandalous Peace" (London: A. Baldwin, 1711). A careful comparison of these pamphlets shows that the text corresponds page for page. The author commences: "Though 'The Examiner' be certainly the most trifling, scurrilous, and malicious writer that ever appeared, yet, in spite of all his gross untruths and absurd notions, by assuming to himself an air of authority, and speaking in the person of one employed by the ministry, he sometimes gives a kind of weight to what he says, so as to make impressions of terror upon honest minds." Then, after quoting several of the Queen's Speeches to Parliament, and the Addresses in reply, he observes: "The 'Examiner' is resolved to continue so faithful to his principal quality of speaking untruths, that he has industriously taken care not to recite truly the very Address he makes it his business to rail at;" and he points out that it was not the "restitution of Spain," but the restoration of the Spanish Monarchy to the House of Austria that was desired. [T. S.]

a stock-jobber, and many other retailers of fraud, shall not only be able to overreach others, much wiser than themselves, but find out new inventions, to elude the force of any law made against them. I suppose, the reason of this may be, that as the aggressor is said to have generally the advantage of the defender; so the makers of the law, which is to defend our rights, have usually not so much industry or vigour, as those whose interest leads them to attack it. Besides, it rarely happens that men are rewarded by the public for their justice and virtue; neither do those who act upon such principles, expect any recompense till the next world: whereas fraud, where it succeeds, gives present pay; and this is allowed the greatest spur imaginable both to labour and invention. When a law is made to stop some growing evil, the wits of those, whose interest it is to break it with secrecy or impunity, are immediately at work; and even among those who pretend to fairer characters, many would gladly find means to avoid, what they would not be thought to violate. They desire to reap the advantage, if possible, without the shame, or at least, without the danger. This art is what I take that dexterous race of men, sprung up soon after the Revolution, to have studied with great application ever since, and to have arrived at great perfection in it. According to the doctrine of some Romish casuists, they have found out *quam propè ad peccatum sine peccato possint accedere.*[1] They can tell how to go within an inch of an impeachment, and yet come back untouched. They know what degree of corruption will just forfeit an employment, and whether the bribe you receive be sufficient to set you right, and put something in your pocket besides. How much to a penny, you may safely cheat the Qu[ee]n, whether forty, fifty or sixty *per cent.* according to the station you are in, and the dispositions of the persons in office, below and above you. They have computed the price you may securely take or give for a place, or what part of the salary you ought to reserve. They can discreetly distribute five hundred pounds in a small borough, without any danger from the statutes, against bribing elections. They can manage a bargain for an office, by a third, fourth

[1] "How near to sin they can go without actually sinning." [T. S.]

or fifth hand, so that you shall not know whom to accuse; and win a thousand guineas at play, in spite of the dice, and send away the loser satisfied: They can pass the most exorbitant accounts, overpay the creditor with half his demands, and sink the rest.

It would be endless to relate, or rather indeed impossible to discover, the several arts which curious men have found out to enrich themselves, by defrauding the public, in defiance of the law. The military men, both by sea and land, have equally cultivated this most useful science: neither hath it been altogether neglected by the other sex; of which, on the contrary, I could produce an instance, that would make ours blush to be so far outdone.

Besides, to confess the truth, our laws themselves are extremely defective in many articles, which I take to be one ill effect of our best possession, liberty. Some years ago, the ambassador of a great prince was arrested,[1] and outrages committed on his person in our streets, without any possibility of redress from Westminster-Hall, or the prerogative of the sovereign; and the legislature was forced to provide a remedy against the like evils in times to come. A commissioner of the stamped paper[2] was lately discovered to have notoriously cheated the public of great sums for many years, by counterfeiting the stamps, which the law had made capital. But the aggravation of his crime, proved to be the cause that saved his life; and that additional heightening circumstance of betraying his trust, was found to be a legal defence. I am assured, that

[1] The Muscovite Ambassador (A. A. Matveof) was arrested and taken out of his coach by violence. A Bill was brought into the House of Commons "for preserving the Privileges of Ambassadors," February 7th, 170$\frac{8}{9}$, and obtained the Royal Assent, April 21st, 1709 (7 Ann. c. 12).

Matveof, it seemed, was arrested by his creditors, who feared that, since he had taken leave at Court, they would never be paid. Peter the Great was angry at the indignity thus offered his representative, and was only unwillingly pacified by the above Act. [T. S.]

[2] Richard Dyet, J.P., "is discovered to have counterfeited stamped paper, in which he was a commissioner; and, with his accomplices, has cheated the Queen of £100,000" (Swift's "Journal to Stella," October 3rd, 1710, vol. ii., p. 20 of present edition). He was tried for felony at the Old Bailey, January 13th, 171$\frac{0}{1}$, and was acquitted, because his offence was only a breach of trust. He was, however, re-committed for trial on the charge of misdemeanour. [T. S.]

the notorious cheat of the brewers at Portsmouth,[1] detected about two months ago in Parliament, cannot by any law now in force, be punished in any degree, equal to the guilt and infamy of it. Nay, what is almost incredible, had Guiscard survived his detestable attempt upon Mr. Harley's person, all the inflaming circumstances of the fact, would not have sufficed, in the opinion of many lawyers, to have punished him with death;[2] and the public must have lain under this dilemma, either to condemn him by a law, *ex post facto* (which would have been of dangerous consequence, and form an ignominious precedent) or undergo the mortification to see the greatest villain upon earth escape unpunished, to the infinite triumph and delight of Popery and faction. But even this is not to be wondered at, when we consider, that of all the insolences offered to the Qu[een] since the Act of Indemnity, (at least, that ever came to my ears) I can hardly instance above two or three, which, by the letter of the law could amount to high treason.

From these defects in our laws, and the want of some discretionary power safely lodged, to exert upon emergencies; as well as from the great acquirements of able men, to elude the penalties of those laws they break, it is no wonder, the injuries done to the public, are so seldom redressed. But besides, no individual suffers, by any wrong he does to the commonwealth, in proportion to the advantage he gains by doing it. There are seven or eight millions who contribute to the loss, while the whole gain is sunk among a few. The

[1] "Some very considerable abuses," the chancellor of the exchequer informed the House of Commons on January 3rd, 171$\frac{0}{1}$, "have been discovered in the victualling." It appears that the seamen in the navy were allowed seven pints of beer per day, during the time they were on board. In port, of course the sailors were permitted to go ashore, but the allowance was stlll charged to the ship's account; and became a perquisite of the purser. It often happened that the contractors did not send in the full amount of beer paid for, but gave the purser money in exchange for the difference. The scandal was brought to the attention of the House as stated, and a committee was appointed to inquire into the abuse. On February 15th the House considered the committee's report, and it was found that Thomas Ridge, Member for Portsmouth, contracted to supply 5,513 tons of beer, and had delivered only 3,213. Several other brewers of Portsmouth had been guilty of the same fraud. Mr. Ridge was expelled the House the same day. [T. S.]

[2] See Swift's "Journal," quoted in notes to No. 33, *ante*, p. 214. [T. S.]

damage suffered by the public, is not so immediately or heavily felt by particular persons, and the zeal of prosecution is apt to drop and be lost among numbers.

But imagine a set of politicians for many years at the head of affairs, the game visibly their own, and by consequence acting with great security: may not these be sometimes tempted to forget their caution, by length of time, by excess of avarice and ambition, by the insolence or violence of their nature, or perhaps by a mere contempt for their adversaries? May not such motives as these, put them often upon actions directly against the law, such as no evasions can be found for, and which will lay them fully open to the vengeance of a prevailing interest, whenever they are out of power? It is answered in the affirmative. And here we cannot refuse the late m[inistr]y their due praises, who foreseeing a storm, provided for their own safety, by two admirable expedients, by which, with great prudence, they have escaped the punishments due to pernicious counsels and corrupt management. The first, was to procure, under pretences hardly specious, a general Act of Indemnity,[1] which cuts off all impeachments. The second, was yet more refined: suppose, for instance, a counsel is to be pursued, which is necessary to carry on the dangerous designs of a prevailing party, to preserve them in power, to gratify the unmeasurable appetites of a few leaders, civil and military, though by hazarding the ruin of the whole nation: this counsel, desperate in itself, unprecedented in the nature of it, they procure a majority to form into an address,[2] which makes it look like the sense of the nation. Under that shelter they carry on their work, and lie secure against after-reckonings.

I must be so free to tell my meaning in this, that among other things, I understand it of the address made to the Qu[een] about three years ago, to desire that her M[ajest]y would not consent to a peace, without the entire restitution of Sp[ai]n.[3]

[1] This Act was passed in 1708. See No. 18, *ante*, and note, p. 105. [T. S.]

[2] The Address from both Houses, presented to the Queen, February 18th, 17$\frac{8}{10}$, prayed that she "would be pleased to order the Duke of Marlborough's immediate departure for Holland, where his presence will be equally necessary, to assist at the negotiations of peace, and to hasten the preparations for an early campaign," etc. [T. S.]

[3] The Address of both Houses to the Queen, presented on December

A proceeding, which to people abroad, must look like the highest strain of temerity, folly, and gasconade. But we at home, who allow the promoters of that advice to be no fools, can easily comprehend the depth and mystery of it. They were assured by this means, to pin down the war upon us, consequently to increase their own power and wealth, and multiply difficulties on the Qu[een] and kingdom, till they had fixed their party too firmly to be shaken, whenever they should find themselves disposed to reverse their address, and give us leave to wish for a peace.

If any man entertains a more favourable opinion of this monstrous step in politics; I would ask him what we must do, in case we find it impossible to recover Spain? Those among the Whigs who believe a God, will confess, that the events of war lie in His hands; and the rest of them, who acknowledge no such power, will allow, that Fortune hath too great a share in the good or ill success of military actions, to let a wise man reason upon them, as if they were entirely in his power. If Providence shall think fit to refuse success to our arms, with how ill a grace, with what shame and confusion, shall we be obliged to recant that precipitate address, unless the world will be so charitable to consider, that parliaments among us, differ as much as princes, and that by the fatal conjunction of many unhappy circumstances, it is very possible for our island to be represented sometimes by those who have the least pretensions to it. So little truth or justice there is in what some pretend to advance, that the actions of former senates, ought always to

23rd, 1707, urged: "That nothing could restore a just balance of power in Europe, but the reducing the whole Spanish monarchy to the obedience of the House of Austria; and . . . That no peace can be honourable or safe, for your Majesty or your allies, if Spain, the West Indies, or any part of the Spanish Monarchy, be suffered to remain under the power of the House of Bourbon." The resolutions as carried in the House of Lords on December 19th did not include the words "or any part of the Spanish Monarchy"; these words were introduced on a motion by Somers who was in the chair when the Select Committee met on December 20th to embody the resolutions in proper form. The altered resolution was quickly hurried through the Lords and agreed to by the Commons, and the Address as amended was presented to the Queen. By this bold move Somers prolonged the war indefinitely. See also note at the commencement of this number. [T. S.]

be treated with respect by the latter; that those assemblies are all equally venerable, and no one to be preferred before another: by which argument, the Parliament that began the rebellion against King Charles the First, voted his trial, and appointed his murderers, ought to be remembered with respect.

But to return from this digression; it is very plain, that considering the defectiveness of our laws, the variety of cases, the weakness of the prerogative, the power or the cunning of ill-designing men, it is possible, that many great abuses may be visibly committed, which cannot be legally punished: especially if we add to this, that some enquiries might probably involve those, whom upon other accounts, it is not thought convenient to disturb. Therefore, it is very false reasoning, especially in the management of public affairs, to argue that men are innocent, because the law hath not pronounced them guilty.

I am apt to think, it was to supply such defects as these, that satire was first introduced into the world; whereby those whom neither religion, nor natural virtue, nor fear of punishment, were able to keep within the bounds of their duty, might be withheld by the shame of having their crimes exposed to open view in the strongest colours, and themselves rendered odious to mankind. Perhaps all this may be little regarded by such hardened and abandoned natures as I have to deal with; but, next to taming or binding a savage animal, the best service you can do the neighbourhood, is to give them warning, either to arm themselves, or not come in its way.

Could I have hoped for any signs of remorse from the leaders of that faction, I should very gladly have changed my style, and forgot or passed by their million of enormities. But they are every day more fond of discovering their impotent zeal and malice: witness their conduct in the city about a fortnight ago,[1] which had no other end imaginable, beside that of perplexing our affairs, and endeavouring to

[1] This refers to the election of the governor and directors of the Bank of England on April 12th and 13th. All the Whig candidates were returned, and Sir H. Furnese was on the same day chosen Alderman for Bridge Within. See also No. 41, *post*, p. 267. [T. S.]

make things desperate, that themselves may be thought necessary. While they continue in this frantic mood, I shall not forbear to treat them as they deserve ; that is to say, as the inveterate, irreconcilable enemies to our country and its constitution..

NUMB. 40.[1]

FROM THURSDAY APRIL 26, TO THURSDAY MAY 3, 1711.

Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?[2]

THERE have been certain topics of reproach, liberally bestowed for some years past, by the Whigs and Tories, upon each other. We charge the former with a design of destroying the established Church, and introducing fanaticism and freethinking in its stead. We accuse them as enemies to monarchy; as endeavouring to undermine the present form of government, and to build a commonwealth, or some new scheme of their own, upon its ruins. On the other side, their clamours against us, may be summed up in those three formidable words, Popery, Arbitrary Power, and the Pretender. Our accusations against them we endeavour to make good by certain overt acts; such as their perpetually abusing the whole body of the clergy; their declared contempt for the very order of priesthood; their aversion for episcopacy; the public encouragement and patronage they gave to Tindall, Toland, and other atheistical writers; their appearing as professed advocates, retained by the Dissenters, excusing their separation, and laying the guilt of it to the obstinacy of the Church; their frequent endeavours to repeal the test, and their setting up the indulgence to scrupulous consciences, as a point of greater importance than the established worship. The regard they bear to our monarchy, hath appeared by their open ridiculing the martyrdom of King Charles the First, in their Calves-head

[1] No. 39 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Juvenal, "Satires," ii. 24.

"Who his spleen could rein,
And hear the Gracchi of the mob complain?"—W. GIFFORD.
[T. S.]

Clubs,[1] their common discourses and their pamphlets: their denying the unnatural war raised against that prince, to have been a rebellion; their justifying his murder in the allowed papers of the week; their industry in publishing and spreading seditious and republican tracts; such as Ludlow's "Memoirs," Sidney "Of Government,"[2] and many others; their endless lopping of the prerogative, and mincing into nothing her M[ajest]y's titles to the crown.

What proofs they bring for our endeavouring to introduce Popery, arbitrary power, and the Pretender, I cannot readily tell, and would be glad to hear; however, those important words having by dexterous management, been found of mighty service to their cause, though applied with little colour, either of reason or justice; I have been considering whether they may not be adapted to more proper objects.

As to Popery, which is the first of these, to deal plainly, I can hardly think there is any set of men among us, except the professors of it, who have any direct intention to introduce it among us: but the question is, whether the principles and practices of us, or the Whigs, be most likely to make way for it? It is allowed, on all hands, that among the methods concerted at Rome, for bringing over England into the bosom of the Catholic Church; one of the chief was, to send Jesuits and other emissaries, in lay habits, who personating tradesmen and mechanics, should mix with the people, and under the pretence of a further and purer reformation, endeavour to divide us into as many sects as possible, which would either put us under the necessity of returning to our old errors, to preserve peace at home; or by our divisions make way for some powerful neighbour, with the assistance of the Pope's permission, and a consecrated banner, to convert and enslave us at once. If this hath been reckoned good politics (and it was the best the

[1] The Calves-Head Club "was erected by an impudent set of people, who have their feast of calves-heads in several parts of the town, on the 30th of January; in derision of the day, and defiance of monarchy" ("Secret History of the Calves-Head Club," 1703). [T. S.]

[2] These works can hardly be called "tracts." Algernon Sidney's "Discourses concerning Government" (1698), is a portly folio of 467 pages, and Ludlow's "Memoirs" (1698-9) occupy three stout octavo volumes. [T. S.]

Jesuit schools could invent) I appeal to any man, whether the Whigs, for many years past, have not been employed in the very same work? They professed on all occasions, that they knew no reason why any one system of speculative opinions (as they termed the doctrines of the Church) should be established by law more than another; or why employments should be confined to the religion of the magistrate, and that called the Church established. The grand maxim they laid down was, That no man, for the sake of a few notions and ceremonies, under the names of doctrine and discipline, should be denied the liberty of serving his country: as if places would go a begging, unless Brownists, Familists, Sweet-singers, Quakers, Anabaptists and Muggletonians, would take them off our hands.

I have been sometimes imagining this scheme brought to perfection, and how diverting it would look to see half a dozen Sweet-singers on the bench in their ermines, and two or three Quakers with their white staves at court. I can only say, this project is the very counterpart of the late King James's design, which he took up as the best method for introducing his own religion, under the pretext of an universal liberty of conscience, and that no difference in religion, should make any in his favour. Accordingly, to save appearances, he dealt some employments among Dissenters of most denominations; and what he did was, no doubt, in pursuance of the best advice he could get at home or abroad; and the Church thought it the most dangerous step he could take for her destruction. It is true, King James admitted Papists among the rest, which the Whigs would not; but this is sufficiently made up by a material circumstance, wherein they seem to have much outdone that prince, and to have carried their liberty of conscience to a higher point, having granted it to all the classes of Free-thinkers, which the nice conscience of a Popish prince would not give him leave to do; and was therein mightily overseen; because it is agreed by the learned, that there is but a very narrow step from atheism, to the other extreme, superstition. So that upon the whole, whether the Whigs had any real design of bringing in Popery or no, it is very plain, that they took the most effectual step towards it; and if the Jesuits had been their immediate directors, they

could not have taught them better, nor have found apter scholars.

Their second accusation is, That we encourage and maintain arbitrary power in princes, and promote enslaving doctrines among the people. This they go about to prove by instances, producing the particular opinions of certain divines in King Charles the Second's reign; a decree of Oxford University,[1] and some few writers since the Revolution. What they mean, is the principle of passive obedience and non-resistance, which those who affirm, did, I believe, never intend should include arbitrary power. However, though I am sensible that it is not reckoned prudent in a dispute, to make any concessions without the last necessity; yet I do agree, that in my own private opinion, some writers did carry that tenet of passive obedience to a height, which seemed hardly consistent with the liberties of a country, whose laws can be neither enacted nor repealed, without the consent of the whole people. I mean not those who affirm it due in general, as it certainly is to the Legislature, but such as fix it entirely in the prince's person. This last has, I believe, been done by a very few; but when the Whigs quote authors to prove it upon us, they bring in all who mention it as a duty in general, without applying it to princes, abstracted from their senate.

By thus freely declaring my own sentiments of passive obedience, it will at least appear, that I do not write for a party: neither do I, upon any occasion, pretend to speak their sentiments, but my own. The majority of the two Houses, and the present ministry (if those be a party) seem

[1] On July 21st, 1683, the University of Oxford passed a decree condemning as "false, seditious, and impious," a series of twenty-seven propositions, among which were the following:

"All civil authority is derived originally from the people."

"The King has but a co-ordinate power, and may be over-ruled by the" Lords and Commons.

"Wicked kings and tyrants ought to be put to death."

"King Charles the First was lawfully put to death."

The decree was reprinted in 17$\frac{0}{0}\frac{0}{0}$ with the title, "An Entire Confutation of Mr. Hoadley's Book, of the Original of Government." It was burnt by the order of the House of Lords, dated March 23rd, 17$\frac{0}{0}$. [T. S.]

to me in all their proceedings, to pursue the real interest of Church and State: and if I shall happen to differ from particular persons among them, in a single notion about government, I suppose they will not, upon that account, explode me and my paper. However, as an answer once for all, to the tedious scurrilities of those idle people, who affirm, I am hired and directed what to write;[1] I must here inform them, that their censure is an effect of their principles: The present m[inistr]y are under no necessity of employing prostitute pens; they have no dark designs to promote, by advancing heterodox opinions.

But (to return) suppose two or three private divines, under King Charles the Second, did a little overstrain the doctrine of passive obedience to princes; some allowance might be given to the memory of that unnatural rebellion against his father, and the dismal consequences of resistance. It is plain, by the proceedings of the Churchmen before and at the Revolution, that this doctrine was never designed to introduce arbitrary power.[2]

I look upon the Whigs and Dissenters to be exactly of the same political faith; let us, therefore, see what share each of them had in advancing arbitrary power. It is manifest, that the fanatics made Cromwell the most absolute tyrant in Christendom:[3] The Rump abolished the House of Lords; the army abolished the Rump; and by this army of *saints*, he governed. The Dissenters took liberty of conscience and employments from the late King James, as an acknowledgment of his dispensing power; which makes a King of England as absolute as the Turk. The Whigs, under the late king, perpetually declared for keeping up a standing

[1] In a letter to Dr. Chenevix, Bishop of Waterford (dated May 23rd, 1758), Lord Chesterfield, speaking of Swift's "Last Four Years," says that it "is a party pamphlet, founded on the lie of the day, which, as Lord Bolingbroke who had read it often assured me, *was coined and delivered out to him, to write 'Examiners,' and other political papers upon*" (Chesterfield's "Works," ii. 498, edit. 1777). [T. S.]

[2] From this and many previous passages it is obvious, that, in joining the Tories, Swift reserved to himself the right of putting his own interpretation upon the speculative points of their political creed. [S.]

[3] See Swift's "Presbyterians' Plea of Merit," and note, vol. iv., p. 36, of present edition. [T. S.]

army, in times of peace; which has in all ages been the first and great step to the ruin of liberty. They were, besides, discovering every day their inclinations to destroy the rights of the Church; and declared their opinion, in all companies, against the bishops sitting in the House of Peers: which was exactly copying after their predecessors of 'Forty-one. I need not say their real intentions were to make the king absolute, but whatever be the designs of innovating men, they usually end in a tyranny: as we may see by an hundred examples in Greece, and in the later commonwealths of Italy, mentioned by Machiavel.

In the third place, the Whigs accuse us of a design to bring in the Pretender; and to give it a greater air of probability, they suppose the Qu[een] to be a party in this design; which however, is no very extraordinary supposition in those who have advanced such singular paradoxes concerning Gregg and Guiscard. Upon this article, their charge is general, without ever offering to produce an instance. But I verily think, and believe it will appear no paradox, that if ever he be brought in, the Whigs are his men. For, first, it is an undoubted truth, that a year or two after the Revolution, several leaders of that party had their pardons sent them by the late King James,[1] and had entered upon measures to restore him, on account of some disobligations they received from King William. Besides, I would ask, whether those who are under the greatest ties of gratitude to King James, are not at this day become the most zealous Whigs? And of what party those are now, who kept a long correspondence with St. Germains?

It is likewise very observable of late, that the Whigs upon all occasions, profess their belief of the Pretender's being no impostor, but a real prince, born of the late Queen's body:[2]

[1] James II. sent a Declaration to England, dated April 20th, 1692, in which he promised to pardon all those who should return to their duty. He made a few exceptions, and among these were Ormonde, Sunderland, Nottingham, Churchill, etc. It is said that of Churchill James remarked that he never could forgive him until he should efface the memory of his ingratitude by some eminent service. [T. S.]

[2] "The Pretended Prince of Wales," as he is styled in several Acts of Parliament, was first called "the Pretender" in Queen Anne's speech to Parliament on March 11th, 170⅞. She then said: "The French fleet sailed from Dunkirk, Tuesday, at three in the morning,

which whether it be true or false, is very unseasonably advanced, considering the weight such an opinion must have with the vulgar, if they once thoroughly believe it. Neither is it at all improbable, that the Pretender himself puts his chief hopes in the friendship he expects from the Dissenters and Whigs, by his choice to invade the kingdom when the latter were most in credit: and he had reason to count upon the former, from the gracious treatment they received from his supposed father, and their joyful acceptance of it. But further, what could be more consistent with the Whiggish notion of a revolution-principle, than to bring in the Pretender? A revolution-principle, as their writings and discourses have taught us to define it, is a principle perpetually disposing men to revolutions: and this is suitable to the famous saying of a great Whig, "That the more revolutions the better"; which how odd a maxim soever in appearance, I take to be the true characteristic of the party.

A dog loves to turn round often; yet after certain revolutions, he lies down to rest: but heads, under the dominion of the moon, are for perpetual changes, and perpetual revolutions: besides, the Whigs owe all their wealth to wars and revolutions; like the girl at Bartholomew-fair, who gets a penny by turning round a hundred times, with swords in her hands.[1]

To conclude, the Whigs have a natural faculty of bringing in pretenders, and will therefore probably endeavour to bring in the great one at last: How many *pretenders* to wit, honour, nobility, politics, have they brought in these last twenty years? In short, they have been sometimes able to procure a majority of pretenders in Parliament; and wanted nothing to render the work complete, except a Pretender at their head.

northward, with the Pretender on board." The same epithet is employed in the Addresses by the two Houses in reply to this speech.

It was currently reported that he was not a son of James II. and Queen Mary. Several pamphlets were written by "W. Fuller," to prove that he was the son of a gentlewoman named Grey, who was brought to England from Ireland in 1688 by the Countess of Tyrconnel. See also note on p. 409 of vol. v. of present edition. [T. S.]

[1] An exhibition described at length in Ward's "London Spy." The wonder and dexterity of the feat consisted in the damsel sustaining a number of drawn swords upright upon her hands, shoulders, and neck, and turning round so nimbly as to make the spectators giddy. [S.]

NUMB. 41.[1]

FROM THURSDAY MAY 3, TO THURSDAY MAY 10, 1711.[2]

Dos est magna parentium virtus.[3]

I TOOK up a paper[4] some days ago in a coffee-house; and if the correctness of the style, and a superior spirit in it, had not immediately undeceived me, I should have been apt to imagine, I had been reading an "Examiner." In this paper, there were several important propositions advanced. For instance, that "Providence raised up Mr. H[arle]y to be an instrument of great good, in a very critical juncture, when it was much wanted." That, "his very enemies acknowledge his eminent abilities, and distinguishing merit, by their unwearied and restless endeavours against his person and reputation": That "they have had an inveterate malice against both": That he "has been wonderfully preserved from *some* unparalleled attempts"; with more to the same purpose. I immediately computed by rules of arithmetic, that in the last cited words there was something more intended than the attempt of Guiscard,

[1] No. 40 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Writing to Stella, May 14th, 1711, Swift informs her: "Dr. Freind was with me, and pulled out a twopenny pamphlet just published called 'The State of Wit,' giving a character of all the papers that have come out of late. The author seems to be a Whig, yet he speaks very highly of a paper called 'The Examiner,' and says the supposed author of it is Dr. Swift" (vol. ii., p. 176, of present edition). [T. S.]

[3] Horace, "Odes," III. xxiv. 21.

"The lovers there for dowry claim
The father's virtue, and the mother's fame."
P. FRANCIS. [T. S.]

[4] "The Congratulatory Speech of William Bromley, Esq., . . . together with the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Answer."—See also No. 42, *post*, pp. 273-4. [T. S.]

which I think can properly pass but for *one* of the "some." And, though I dare not pretend to guess the author's meaning; yet the expression allows such a latitude, that I would venture to hold a wager, most readers, both Whig and Tory, have agreed with me, that this plural number must, in all probability, among other facts, take in the business of Gregg.[1]

See now the difference of styles. Had I been to have told my thoughts on this occasion; instead of saying how Mr. H[arle]y was "treated by some persons," and "preserved from some unparalleled attempts"; I should with intolerable bluntness and ill manners, have told a formal story, of a com[mitt]ee[2] sent to a condemned criminal in Newgate, to bribe him with a pardon, on condition he would swear high treason against his master, who discovered his correspondence, and secured his person, when a certain grave politician had given him warning to make his escape: and by this means I should have drawn a whole swarm of hedge-writers to exhaust their catalogue of scurrilities against me as a liar, and a slanderer. But with submission to the author of that forementioned paper, I think he has carried that expression to the utmost it will bear: for after all this noise, I know of but two "attempts" against Mr. H[arle]y, that can really be called "unparalleled," which are those aforesaid of Gregg and Guiscard; and as to the rest, I will engage to parallel them from the story of Catiline, and others I could produce.

However, I cannot but observe, with infinite pleasure, that a great part of what I have charged upon the late prevailing faction, and for affirming which, I have been adorned with so many decent epithets, hath been sufficiently confirmed at several times, by the resolutions of one or the

[1] See No. 33, *ante*, pp. 207-14. [T. S.]

[2] The writer of "A Letter to the Seven Lords" says this means "that there was a committee of seven lords, sent to a condemned criminal in Newgate, to bribe him with a pardon, on condition he would swear high treason, against his master."

In Hoffman's "Secret Transactions" (pp. 14, 15) the matter is thus referred to: "Who those persons were that offered Gregg his life, with great preferments and advantages (if he would but accuse his master) may not uneasily be guessed at, for most of the time he was locked up none but people of note, were permitted to come near him, who made him strange promises, and often repeated them." [T. S.]

other House of Parliament.[1] I may therefore now say, I hope, with good authority, that there have been "some unparalleled attempts" against Mr. Harley. That the late ministry were justly to blame in some management, which occasioned the unfortunate battle of Almanza,[2] and the disappointment at Toulon.[3] That the public has been grievously wronged by most notorious frauds, during the Whig administration. That those who advised the bringing in the Palatines,[4] were enemies to the kingdom. That the late managers of the revenue have not duly passed their accounts,[5] for a great part of thirty-five millions, and ought not to be trusted in such employments any more. Perhaps in a little time, I may venture to affirm some other paradoxes of this kind, and produce the same vouchers. And perhaps also, if it had not been so busy a period, instead of one "Examiner," the late ministry might have had above four hundred, each of whose little fingers would be heavier than my loins. It makes me think of Neptune's threat to the winds:

[1] "He does, with his own impudence, and with the malice of a devil, bring in both Houses of P—— to say and mean the same thing. . . . It is matter of wonder . . . to see the greatest ministers of state we ever had (till now) treated by a poor paper-pedlar, every Thursday, like the veriest rascals in the kingdom. . . . I could, if it were needful, bring a great many instances, of this licentious way of the scum of mankind's treating the greatest peers in the nation" ("A Letter to the Seven Lords"). [T. S.]

[2] The Earl of Galway was defeated by the Duke of Berwick at this battle on April 25th, 1707. [T. S.]

[3] The Allies, under the Duke of Savoy, unsuccessfully laid siege to Toulon from July 26th to August 21st, 1707. [T. S.]

[4] The Palatines, who were mostly Lutherans, came over to England in great numbers in May and June of 1709. So large was the immigration that the House of Commons, on April 14th, 1711, passed a resolution declaring that the inviting and bringing over of the Palatines "at the public expense, was an extravagant and unreasonable charge to the kingdom, and a scandalous misapplication of the public money." Whoever advised it, said the resolution, "was an enemy to the Queen and this kingdom." [T. S.]

[5] A Committee, appointed January 13th, 171$\frac{0}{1}$, reported in April, 1711, that accounts for £35,302,107 18*s.* 9$\frac{5}{8}$*d.* (*sic*) had not been passed. On February 21st, 171$\frac{1}{2}$, the auditors presented a statement which showed that of these accounts (which went back to 1681), £6,133,571 had then been passed, and that a considerable portion of the remainder was waiting for technicalities only. On June 11th, 1713, it was reported that £24,624,436 had been either passed or "adjusted." See "Journals of House of Commons," xvi., xvii. [T. S.]

Quos ego—sed motos praestat componere fluctus.[1]

Thus when these sons of Aeolus, had almost sunk the ship with the tempests they raised, it was necessary to smooth the ocean, and secure the vessel, instead of pursuing the offenders.

But I observe the general expectation at present, instead of dwelling any longer upon conjectures who is to be punished for past miscarriages, seems bent upon the rewards intended to those, who have been so highly instrumental in rescuing our constitution from its late dangers. It is the observation of Tacitus, in the life of Agricola, that his eminent services had raised a general opinion of his being designed, by the emperor, for praetor of Britain. *Nullis in hoc suis sermonibus, sed quia par videbatur:* and then he adds, *Non semper errat fama, aliquando et eligit.*[2] The judgment of a wise prince, and the general disposition of the people, do often point at the same person; and sometimes the popular wishes, do even foretell the reward intended for some superior merit. Thus among several deserving persons, there are two,[3] whom the public vogue hath in a peculiar manner singled out, as designed very soon to receive the choicest marks of the royal favour. One of them to be placed in a very high station, and both to increase the number of our nobility. This, I say, is the general conjecture; for I pretend to none, nor will be chargeable if it be not fulfilled; since it is enough for their honour, that the nation thinks them worthy of the greatest rewards.

Upon this occasion I cannot but take notice, that of all the heresies in politics, profusely scattered by the partisans

[1] Virgil, "Aeneid," i. 135.

"Whom I—but first this uproar must be quelled."—R. KENNEDY. [T. S.]

[2] Tacitus, "Agricola," 9. (Tacitus wrote "Haud semper," etc.) "An opinion not founded upon any suggestions of his own, but upon his being thought equal to the station. Common fame does not always err, sometimes it even directs a choice" ("Oxford Translation" revised). [T. S.]

[3] Harley, who was created Earl of Oxford and Earl Mortimer, May 23rd, 1711, and Sir Simon Harcourt, made Baron Harcourt, September 3rd, 1711. [T. S.]

of the late administration, none ever displeased me more, or seemed to have more dangerous consequences to monarchy, than that pernicious talent so much affected, of discovering a contempt for birth, family, and ancient nobility. All the threadbare topics of poets and orators were displayed to discover to us, that merit and virtue were the only nobility; and that the advantages of blood, could not make a knave or a fool either honest or wise. Most popular commotions we read of in histories of Greece and Rome, took their rise from unjust quarrels to the nobles; and in the latter, the plebeians' encroachments on the patricians, were the first cause of their ruin.

Suppose there be nothing but opinion in the difference of blood; every body knows, that authority is very much founded on opinion. But surely, that difference is not wholly imaginary. The advantages of a liberal education, of choosing the best companions to converse with; not being under the necessity of practising little mean tricks by a scanty allowance; the enlarging of thought, and acquiring the knowledge of men and things by travel; the example of ancestors inciting to great and good actions. These are usually some of the opportunities, that fall in the way of those who are born, of what we call the better families; and allowing genius to be equal in them and the vulgar, the odds are clearly on their side. Nay, we may observe in some, who by the appearance of merit, or favour of fortune, have risen to great stations, from an obscure birth, that they have still retained some sordid vices of their parentage or education, either insatiable avarice, or ignominious falsehood and corruption.

To say the truth, the great neglect of education, in several noble families, whose sons are suffered to pass the most improvable seasons of their youth, in vice and idleness, have too much lessened their reputation: but even this misfortune we owe, among all the rest, to that Whiggish practice of reviling the Universities, under the pretence of their instilling pedantry, narrow principles, and high-church doctrines.

I would not be thought to undervalue merit and virtue, wherever they are to be found; but will allow them capable of the highest dignities in a state, when they are in a very

great degree of eminence. A pearl holds its value though it be found in a dunghill; but however, that is not the most probable place to search for it. Nay, I will go farther, and admit, that a man of quality without merit, is just so much the worse for his quality; which at once sets his vices in a more public view, and reproaches him for them. But on the other side, I doubt, those who are always undervaluing the advantages of birth, and celebrating personal merit, have principally an eye to their own, which they are fully satisfied with, and which nobody will dispute with them about; whereas they cannot, without impudence and folly, pretend to be nobly born: because this is a secret too easily discovered: for no men's parentage is so nicely inquired into, as that of assuming upstarts; especially when they affect to make it better than it is, as they often do, or behave themselves with insolence.

But whatever may be the opinion of others upon this subject, whose philosophical scorn for blood and families, reaches even to those that are royal, or perhaps took its rise from a Whiggish contempt of the latter; I am pleased to find two such instances of extraordinary merit, as I have mentioned, joined with ancient and honourable birth, which whether it be of real or imaginary value, hath been held in veneration by all wise, polite states, both ancient and modern. And, as much a foppery, as men pretend to think it, nothing is more observable in those who rise to great place or wealth, from mean originals, than their mighty solicitude to convince the world that they are not so low as is commonly believed. They are glad to find it made out by some strained genealogy, that they have some remote alliance with better families. Cromwell himself was pleased with the impudence of a flatterer, who undertook to prove him descended from a branch of the royal stem. I know a citizen,[1] who adds or alters a letter in his name with every plum he acquires: he

[1] Sir Henry Furnese (1658-1712), Bart. He obtained his baronetcy June 18th, 1707, and was the first to receive that dignity since the Union. He sat in the House as Member for Bramber and Sandwich, and was twice expelled. He was, however, re-elected for Sandwich and represented that constituency until his death on November 30th, 1712.

The variety of ways in which his name has been spelt is quite remark-

now wants but the change of a vowel, to be allied to a sovereign prince in Italy; and that perhaps he may contrive to be done, by a *mistake* of the graver upon his tombstone.

When I am upon this subject of nobility, I am sorry for the occasion given me, to mention the loss of a person who was so great an ornament to it, as the late lord president;[1] who began early to distinguish himself in the public service, and passed through the highest employments of state, in the most difficult times, with great abilities and untainted honour. As he was of a good old age, his principles of religion and loyalty had received no mixture from late infusions, but were instilled into him by his illustrious father, and other noble spirits, who had exposed their lives and fortunes for the royal martyr.

—— *Pulcherrima proles,*
Magnanimi heroes nati melioribus annis.[2]

His first great action was, like Scipio, to defend his father,[3] when oppressed by numbers; and his filial piety was not only rewarded with long life, but with a son, who upon the like occasion, would have shewn the same resolution. No man ever preserved his dignity better when he was out of

able. In the "Calendar of State Papers" for 1691 and 1692, the name is given as Furness, Furnese, and Furnes. The "Journals of the House of Commons," recording his expulsion, speaks of him as Furnesse. When he was knighted (October 11th, 1691), the "Gazette" of October 19th printed it Furnace, and when he was made a baronet, the same journal had it Furnese. In the official "Return of Names of Members," the name is given successively as, Furnace, Furnac, Furnice, Furnise, Furness and Furnese. [T. S.]

[1] Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester, second son of the first Earl of Clarendon (see No. 27, *ante*, p. 170). He undertook the defence of his father when the latter was impeached by the House of Commons, October 30th, 1667, on a charge of high treason. [T. S.]

[2] Virgil, "Aeneid," vi. 648-9.

> "Warriors, high souled, in better ages born,
> Great Teucer's noble race, these plains adorn."—J. M. KING.
> [T. S.]

[3] "When the tumultuous perplexed charge of accumulated treasons was preferred against him by the Commons; his son Laurence, then a Member of that House, stept forth with this brave defiance to his accusers, that, if they could make out any proof of any one single article, he would, as he was authorized, join in the condemnation of his father" (Burton's "Genuineness of Clarendon's History," p. 111). [T. S.]

power, nor shewed more affability while he was in. To conclude: his character (which I do not here pretend to draw) is such, as his nearest friends may safely trust to the most impartial pen; nor wants the least of that allowance which, they say, is required for those who are dead.

NUMB. 42.[1]

FROM THURSDAY MAY 10, TO THURSDAY MAY 17, 1711.

——— Quem cur distringere coner,
Tutus ab infestis latronibus?[2]

I NEVER let slip an opportunity of endeavouring to convince the world, that I am not partial, and to confound the idle reproach of my being hired or directed what to write in defence of the present ministry,[3] or for detecting the practices of the former. When I first undertook this paper, I firmly resolved, that if ever I observed any gross neglect, abuse or corruption in the public management, which might give any just offence to reasonable people, I would take notice of it with that innocent boldness which becomes an honest man, and a true lover of his country; at the same time preserving the respect due to persons so highly entrusted by so wise and excellent a Queen. I know not how such a liberty might have been resented; but I thank God there has been no occasion given me to exercise it; for I can safely affirm, that I have with the utmost rigour, examined all the actions of the present ministry, as far as they fall under general cognizance, without being able to accuse them of one ill or mistaken step. Observing indeed some time ago, that seeds of dissension[4] had been plentifully scattered from

[1] No. 41 in the reprint. [T. S.]
[2] Horace, "Satires," II. i. 41-2.

"Safe it lies
Within the sheath, till villains round me rise."—P. FRANCIS.
[T. S.]

[3] See No. 40, *ante*, and note, p. 259. [T. S.]
[4] In "A Discourse of the Contests and Dissensions . . . Athens and Rome," 1701 (vol. i., pp. 227-270, of present edition). See also Swift's reference to this pamphlet in his "Memoirs Relating to that Change," etc. (vol. v., p. 379). [T. S.]

a certain corner, and fearing they began to rise and spread, I immediately writ a paper on the subject; which I treated with that warmth I thought it required: but the prudence of those at the helm soon prevented this growing evil; and at present it seems likely to have no consequences.

I have had indeed for some time a small occasion of quarrelling, which I thought too inconsiderable for a formal subject of complaint, though I have hinted at it more than once. But it is grown at present to as great a height, as a matter of that nature can possibly bear; and therefore I conceive it high time that an effectual stop should be put to it. I have been amazed at the flaming licentiousness of several weekly papers, which for some months past, have been chiefly employed in barefaced scurrilities against those who are in the greatest trust and favour with the Qu[een], with the first and last letters of their names frequently printed; or some periphrasis describing their station, or other innuendoes, contrived too plain to be mistaken. The consequence of which is, (and it is natural it should be so) that their long impunity hath rendered them still more audacious.

At this time I particularly intend a paper called the "Medley"; whose indefatigable, incessant railings against me, I never thought convenient to take notice of, because it would have diverted my design, which I thought was of public use.[1] Besides, I never yet observed that writer, or those writers, (for it is every way a "Medley") to argue against any one material point or fact that I had advanced, or make one fair quotation. And after all, I knew very well how soon the world grow weary of controversy. It is plain

[1] "The Medley," under Maynwaring, with occasional help from Addison and Steele, seems to have been published for the sole purpose of replying to the "Examiner." No. 40 (July 2nd, 1711) begins: "The 'Examiner' is grown so insipid and contemptible that my acquaintance are offended at my troubling myself about him." No. 45 (the final number, August 6th, 1711) expresses the writer's "deep concern" for the loss of his "dear friend 'The Examiner,' who has at once left the world and me, quite unprovided for so great a blow." When the "Examiner" was revived by W. Oldisworth in December, 1711, it was soon followed by a reappearance of "The Medley." It started afresh with Numb. I. on March 3rd, 1712 (*i.e.* 171½), and continued until August 4th, 1712, the date of the publication of Numb. XLV. [T. S.]

to me, that three or four hands at least have been joined at times in that worthy composition; but the outlines as well as the finishing, seem to have been always the work of the same pen, as it is visible from half a score beauties of style inseparable from it. But who these Meddlers are, or where the judicious leaders have picked them up, I shall never go about to conjecture: factious rancour, false wit, abandoned scurrility, impudent falsehood, and servile pedantry, having so many fathers, and so few to own them, that curiosity herself would not be at the pains to guess. It is the first time I ever did myself the honour to mention that admirable paper: nor could I imagine any occasion likely to happen, that would make it necessary for me to engage with such an adversary. This paper is weekly published, and as appears by the number, has been so for several months, and is next to the "Observator,"[1] allowed to be the best production of the party. Last week my printer brought me that of May 7, Numb. 32. where there are two paragraphs[2] relating to the

[1] See No. 16, *ante*, and note p. 85. [T. S.]

[2] The two paragraphs appeared in No. 32 of "The Medley," and the writer introduces them by a reference to "praise and censure, which I choose out of all the rest, because it only concerns the 'Examiner' to be well instructed in them, he having no other business but to flatter the new m[inistry], and abuse the old." The first paragraph runs:

"In the first place, whenever any body would praise another, all he can say will have no weight or effect, if it be not true or probable. If therefore, for example, my friend should take it into his head to commend a man, *for having been an instrument of great good to a nation*, when in truth that very person had brought that same nation under great difficulties, to say no more; such ill-chosen flattery would be of no use or moment, nor add the least credit to the person so commended. Or if he should take that occasion to revive any false and groundless calumny upon other men, or another party of men; such an instance of *impotent but inveterate malice*, would make him still appear more vile and contemptible. The reason of all which is, that what he said was neither just, proper, nor real, and therefore must needs want the force of true eloquence, which consists in nothing else but in well representing things as they really are. I advise therefore my friend, before he praises any more of his heroes, to learn the common rules of writing; and particularly to read over and over a certain chapter in Aristotle's first book of Rhetoric, where are given very proper and necessary directions, *for praising a man who has done nothing that he ought to be praised for*."

There is no reference here to the Speaker. The reference is to the

Speaker of the House of Commons, and to Mr. Harley; which, as little as I am inclined to engage with such an antagonist, I cannot let pass, without failing in my duty to the public: and if those in power will suffer such infamous insinuations to pass with impunity, they act without precedent from any age or country of the world.

I desire to open this matter, and leave the Whigs themselves to determine upon it. The House of Commons resolved, *nemine contradicente*, that the Speaker should congratulate Mr. Harley's escape and recovery[1] in the name of the House, upon his first attendance on their service. This is accordingly done; and the speech, together with the chancellor of the exchequer's, are printed by order of the House.[2] The author of the "Medley" takes this speech to task the very next week after it is published, telling us, in the aforesaid paper, that the Speaker's commending Mr. Harley, for being "an instrument of great good" to the nation, was "ill-

"Examiner"; nor is there any mention of Providence having wonderfully preserved him from some unparalleled attempts.

The second paragraph runs:

"But the ancients did not think it enough for men to speak what was true or probable, they required further that their orators should be heartily in earnest; and that they should have all those motions and affections in their own minds which they endeavoured to raise in others. He that thinks, says Cicero, to warm others with his eloquence, must first be warm himself. And Quintilian says, We must first be affected ourselves, before we can move others. This made Pliny's panegyric upon Trajan so well received by his hearers, because every body knew the wonderful esteem and affection which he had for the person he commended: and therefore, when he concluded with a prayer to Jupiter, that he would take care of the life and safety of that great and good man, which he said contained in it all other blessings; though the expression was so high, it passed very well with those that heard him, as being agreeable to the known sentiments and affection of the speaker. Whereas, if my friend should be known to bear ill-will to another person, or to have an extreme bad opinion of him, or to think him an obstructor of those fine measures he would bring about, and should yet in one of his panegyrics pray to God for the continuance of that very person's life, as '*an invaluable blessing*'; such a fulsome piece of insincerity would only expose him to shame and derision." [T. S.]

[1] The House of Commons resolved on April 11th, that the Speaker should congratulate Mr. Harley when he was able to attend the House. This was done on April 26th. [T. S.]

[2] The House of Commons, on April 27th, ordered, "That Mr. Speaker be desired to print his congratulatory speech . . . with the Answer of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer to the same." [T. S.]

chosen flattery"; because Mr. Harley had brought the "nation under great difficulties, to say no more:" He says, that when the Speaker tells Mr. Harley, that Providence has "wonderfully preserved" him "from some unparalleled attempts" (for that the "Medley" alludes to) he only "revives a false and groundless calumny upon other men"; which is "an instance of impotent, but inveterate malice,"[1] that makes him [the Speaker] "still appear more vile and contemptible." This is an extract from his first paragraph. In the next this writer says, that the Speaker's "praying to God for the continuance of Mr. Harley's life, as an invaluable blessing,[2] was a fulsome piece of insincerity, which exposes him to shame and derision"; because he is "known to bear ill will to Mr. Harley, to have an extreme bad opinion of him, and to think him an obstructor of those fine measures he would bring about."

I now appeal to the Whigs themselves, whether a great minister of state, in high favour with the Qu[een], and a Speaker of the House of Commons, were ever publicly treated after so extraordinary a manner, in the most licentious times? For this is not a clandestine libel stolen into the world, but openly printed and sold, with the bookseller's name and place of abode at the bottom. And the juncture is admirable, when Mr. H[arle]y is generally believed upon the very point to be made an earl, and promoted to the most important station of the kingdom:[3] nay, the very marks of esteem he hath so lately received from the whole representative body of the people, are called "ill-chosen flattery," and "a fulsome piece of insincerity," exposing the donors "to shame and derision."

Does this intrepid writer think he has sufficiently disguised the matter, by that stale artifice of altering the story, and putting it as a supposed case? Did any man who ever saw the congratulatory speech, read either of those paragraphs in

[1] The Speaker thanks God that Harley's enemies had "not been able to accomplish what their inveterate, but impotent, malice, had designed." [T. S.]

[2] The Speaker prayed that Providence might "continue still to preserve so invaluable a life." [T. S.]

[3] Harley was appointed lord treasurer, May 30th, 1711, and created Earl of Oxford, May 23rd. [T. S.]

the "Medley," without interpreting them just as I have done? Will the author declare upon his great sincerity, that he never had any such meaning? Is it enough, that a jury at Westminster-Hall would, perhaps, not find him guilty of defaming the Speaker and Mr. Harley in that paper? which however, I am much in doubt of too; and must think the law very defective, if the reputation of such persons must lie at the mercy of such pens. I do not remember to have seen any libel, supposed to be writ with caution and double meaning, in order to prevent prosecution, delivered under so thin a cover, or so unartificially made up as this; whether it were from an apprehension of his readers' dullness, or an effect of his own. He hath transcribed the very phrases of the Speaker, and put them in a different character, for fear they might pass unobserved, and to prevent all possibility of being mistaken. I shall be pleased to see him have recourse to the old evasion, and say, that I who make the application, am chargeable with the abuse: let any reader of either party be judge. But I cannot forbear asserting, as my opinion, that for a m[inist]ry to endure such open calumny, without calling the author to account, is next to deserving it. And this is an omission I venture to charge upon the present m[inist]ry, who are too apt to despise little things, which however have not always little consequences.

When this paper was first undertaken, one design, among others, was, to *Examine* some of those writings so frequently published with an evil tendency, either to religion or government; but I was long diverted by other enquiries, which I thought more immediately necessary; to animadvert upon men's actions, rather than their speculations: to shew the necessity there was of changing the ministry, that our constitution in Church and State might be preserved; to expose some dangerous principles and practices under the former administration, and prove by many instances, that those who are now at the helm, are entirely in the true interest of prince and people. This I may modestly hope, hath in some measure been already done, sufficient to answer the end proposed, which was to inform the ignorant and those at distance, and to convince such as are not engaged in a party, from other motives than that of conscience. I know not whether I shall have any appetite to continue this work

much longer; if I do, perhaps some time may be spent in exposing and overturning the false reasonings of those who engage their pens on the other side, without losing time in vindicating myself against their scurrilities, much less in retorting them. Of this sort there is a certain humble companion, a French *maître de langues*,[1] who every month publishes an extract from votes, newspapers, speeches and proclamations, larded with some insipid remarks of his own; which he calls "The Political State of Great Britain:"[2] This ingenious piece he tells us himself, is constantly translated into French, and printed in Holland, where the Dutch, no doubt, conceive most noble sentiments of us, conveyed through such a vehicle. It is observable in his account for April, that the vanity, so predominant in many of his nation, has made him more concerned for the honour of Guiscard, than the safety of Mr. H[arle]y: And for fear we should think the worse of his country upon that assassin's account,[3] he tells us, there have been more murders, parricides and villanies, committed in England, than any other part of the world. I cannot imagine how an illiterate foreigner, who is neither master of our language, or indeed of common sense, and who is devoted to a faction, I suppose, for no other reason, but his having more Whig customers than Tories, should take it into his head to write politic tracts of our affairs. But I presume, he builds upon the foundation of having being called to an account for his insolence in one of his former monthly productions,[4] which is a method that

[1] Abel Boyer (1667-1729), author of a French dictionary, a French grammar, "History of William III.," "History of Queen Anne," "The Political State," "The Post Boy" (1705-9), and many other works. [T. S.]

[2] "The Political State of Great Britain" was started in January, 171$\frac{0}{1}$, and continued monthly until 1740. [T. S.]

[3] See No. 33, *ante*, and note, p. 207. [T. S.]

[4] Boyer appeared before the House of Lords, March 6th, 171$\frac{0}{1}$, and owned that he was the compiler of "The Political State of Great Britain." He was kept in custody till March 12th, when he was reprimanded, and discharged after he had paid his fees. His offence was that "an account is pretended to be given of the Debates and Proceedings of this House" ("Journals of House of Lords," xix). The third number of "The Political State," Boyer issued on March 17th, giving his reason for the delay in its appearance: "An unavoidable and unvoluntary avocation, of which I may give you an account hereafter, has obliged me to write to you a fortnight later than usual." [T. S.]

seldom fails of giving some vogue to the foolishest composition. If such a work must be done, I wish some tolerable hand would undertake it; and that we would not suffer a little whiffling Frenchman to neglect his trade of teaching his language to our children, and presume to instruct foreigners in our politics.

NUMB. 43.[1]

FROM THURSDAY MAY 17, TO THURSDAY MAY 24, 1711.

Delicta majorum immeritus lues,
Romane; donec templa refeceris,
Aedesque labentes deorum——[2]

SEVERAL letters have been lately sent me, desiring I would make honourable mention of the pious design of building fifty churches, in several parts of London and Westminster, where they are most wanted; occasioned by an address of the convocation to the Queen,[3] and recom-

[1] No. 42 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Horace, "Odes," III. vi. 1-3.

"Those ills your ancestors have done,
Romans, are now become your own;
And they will cost you dear,
Unless you soon repair
The falling temples which the gods provoke."
EARL OF ROSCOMMON (1672).
[T. S.]

[3] The minister and churchwardens of Greenwich applied to the House of Commons on February 14th, 171⅓, for aid in the rebuilding of their church. The House referred the application to a committee. On February 28th the lower house of Convocation sent a deputation to the Speaker expressing their satisfaction at what had been done. On his reporting this to the House on the following day, they expressed their readiness to receive information. The lower house of Convocation prepared a scheme and presented it to the Speaker on March 9th; this was referred to the committee on the 10th. Acting on a hint received from the court, the bishops and clergy presented an Address to the Queen on March 26th, and this was followed by a Message from Her Majesty, on the 29th, to the House of Commons, recommending that Parliament should undertake "the great and necessary work of building more churches." On April 9th the House of Commons replied in an Address, promising to make provision, and resolved, on May 1st, to grant a supply for building fifty new churches in or about London and Westminster. On May 8th it fixed the amount at a sum "not exceeding £350,000." In pursuance of this a Bill was intro-

mended by her Majesty to the House of Commons; who immediately promised, they would enable her "to accomplish so excellent a design," and are now preparing a Bill accordingly. I thought to have deferred any notice of this important affair till the end of this session; at which time I proposed to deliver a particular account of the great and useful things already performed by this present Parliament. But in compliance to those who give themselves the trouble of advising me; and partly convinced by the reasons they offer; I am content to bestow a paper upon a subject, that indeed so well deserves it.

The clergy, and whoever else have a true concern for the constitution of the Church, cannot but be highly pleased with one prospect in this new scene of public affairs. They may very well remember the time, when every session of Parliament, was like a cloud hanging over their heads; and if it happened to pass without bursting into some storm upon the Church, we thanked God, and thought it an happy escape till the next meeting; upon which we resumed our secret apprehensions, though we were not allowed to believe any danger. Things are now altered; the Parliament takes the necessities of the Church into consideration, receives the proposals of the clergy met in convocation, and amidst all the exigencies of a long expensive war, and under the pressure of heavy debts, finds a supply for erecting fifty edifices for the service of God. And it appears by the address of the Commons to her Majesty upon this occasion (wherein they discovered a true spirit of religion) that the applying the money granted "to accomplish so excellent a design,"[1] would, in their opinion, be the most effectual way

duced on May 18th, which received the Royal Assent on June 12th (9 Ann. c. 17). This Bill granted £350,000 (to be raised by a duty on coals) for building fifty new churches in London and Westminster.

In this connection it is interesting to remember that Swift, two years before, had recommended the building of more churches as part of his suggestions for "the advancement of religion." See his "Project for the Advancement of Religion" (vol. iii., p. 45 of present edition). [T. S.]

[1] In their Address, on April 9th, 1711, the House of Commons said: "Neither the long expensive war, in which we are engaged, nor the pressure of heavy debts, under which we labour, shall hinder us from granting to your Majesty whatever is necessary, to accomplish so excellent a design, which, we hope, may be a means of drawing down

of carrying on the war; that it would (to use their own words) "be a means of drawing down blessings on her Majesty's undertakings, as it adds to the number of those places, where the prayers of her devout and faithful subjects, will be daily offered up to God, for the prosperity of her government at home, and the success of her arms abroad."

I am sometimes hoping, that we are not naturally so bad a people, as we have appeared for some years past. Faction, in order to support itself, is generally forced to make use of such abominable instruments, that as long as it prevails, the genius of a nation is overpressed, and cannot appear to exert itself: but when *that* is broke and suppressed, when things return to the old course, mankind will naturally fall to act from principles of reason and religion. The Romans, upon a great victory, or escape from public danger, frequently built a temple in honour of some god, to whose peculiar favour they imputed their success or delivery: and sometimes the general did the like, *at his own expense*, to acquit himself of some pious vow he had made. How little of any thing resembling this hath been done by us after all our victories! and perhaps for that reason, among others, they have turned to so little account. But what could we expect? We acted all along as if we believed nothing of a God or His providence; and therefore it was consistent to offer up our edifices only to those, whom we looked upon as givers of all victory, in His stead.

I have computed, that fifty churches may be built by a medium, at six thousand pound for a church; which is somewhat *under* the price of a subject's palace: yet perhaps the care of above two hundred thousand souls, with the benefit of their prayers for the prosperity of their Queen and country, may be almost put in the balance with the domestic convenience, or even magnificence of any subject whatsoever.

Sir William Petty, who under the name of Captain

blessings from Heaven on all your Majesty's other undertakings, as it adds to the number of those places, where the prayers of your devout and faithful subjects will be daily offered up to God, for the prosperity of your Majesty's government at home, and the success of your arms abroad." [T. S.]

Graunt, published some observations upon bills of mortality about five years after the Restoration;[1] tells us, the parishes in London, were even then so unequally divided, that some were two hundred times larger than others. Since that time, the increase of trade, the frequency of Parliaments, the desire of living in the metropolis, together with that genius for building, which began after the fire, and hath ever since continued, have prodigiously enlarged this town on all sides, where it was capable of increase; and those tracts of land built into streets, have generally continued of the same parish they belonged to, while they lay in fields; so that the care of above thirty thousand souls, hath been sometimes committed to one minister, whose church would hardly contain the twentieth part of his flock: neither, I think, was any family in those parishes obliged to pay above a groat a year to their spiritual pastor. Some few of those parishes have been since divided; in others were erected chapels of ease, where a preacher is maintained by general contribution. Such poor shifts and expedients, to the infinite shame and scandal, of so vast and flourishing a city, have been thought sufficient for the service of God and religion; as if they were circumstances wholly indifferent.

This defect, among other consequences of it, hath made schism a sort of necessary evil, there being at least three hundred thousand inhabitants in this town, whom the churches would not be able to contain, if the people were ever so well disposed: and in a city not overstocked with zeal, the only way to preserve any degree of religion, is to make all attendance upon the duties of it, as easy and cheap as possible: whereas on the contrary, in the larger parishes, the press is so great, and the pew-keeper's tax so exorbitant, that those who love to save trouble and money, either stay at home, or retire to the conventicles. I believe there are few examples in any Christian country of so great a neglect for religion; and the dissenting teachers have made their advantages largely by it, "sowing tares among the wheat while men slept;" being much more expert at procuring

[1] "Natural and Political Observations . . . upon the Bills of Mortality." By John Graunt, 1662. The writer says in chap. x. that Cripplegate parish was two hundred times as big as some of the parishes in the city. [T. S.]

contributions, which is a trade they are bred up in, than men of a liberal education.

And to say truth, the way practised by several parishes in and about this town, of maintaining their clergy by voluntary subscriptions, is not only an indignity to the character, but hath many pernicious consequences attending it; such a precarious dependence, subjecting a clergyman, who hath not more than ordinary spirit and resolution, to many inconveniences, which are obvious to imagine: but this defect will, no doubt, be remedied by the wisdom and piety of the present Parliament; and a tax laid upon every house in a parish, for the support of their pastor. Neither indeed can it be conceived, why a house, whose purchase is not reckoned above one-third less than land of the same yearly rent, should not pay a twentieth part annually (which is half tithe) to the support of the minister. One thing I could wish, that in fixing the maintenance to the several ministers in these new intended parishes, no determinate sum of money may be named, which in all perpetuities ought by any means to be avoided; but rather a tax in proportion to the rent of each house, though it be but a twentieth or even a thirtieth part. The contrary of this, I am told, was done in several parishes of the city after the fire; where the incumbent and his successors were to receive for ever a certain sum; for example, one or two hundred pounds a year. But the lawgivers did not consider, that what we call at present, one hundred pounds, will, in process of time, have not the intrinsic value of twenty; as twenty pounds now are hardly equal to forty shillings, three hundred years ago. There are a thousand instances of this all over England, in reserved rents applied to hospitals, in old chiefries, and even among the clergy themselves, in those payments which, I think, they call a *modus*.[1]

As no prince had ever better dispositions than her present Majesty, for the advancement of true religion, so there was never any age that produced greater occasions to employ them on. It is an unspeakable misfortune, that any designs of so excellent a Queen, should be checked by the necessities of a long and ruinous war, which the folly or corrup-

[1] An abbreviation of *modus decimandi*, a composition in lieu of payment of tithes. [T. S.]

tion of modern politicians have involved us in, against all the maxims whereby our country flourished so many hundred years: else her Majesty's care of religion would certainly have reached even to her American plantations. Those noble countries, stocked by numbers from hence, whereof too many are in no very great reputation for faith or morals, will be a perpetual reproach to us, till some better care is taken for cultivating Christianity among them. If the governors of those several colonies were obliged, at certain times, to transmit an exact representation of the state of religion, in their several districts; and the legislature here would, in a time of leisure, take that affair under their consideration, it might be perfected with little difficulty, and be a great addition to the glories of her Majesty's reign.

But to waive further speculations upon so remote a scene, while we have subjects enough to employ them on at home; it is to be hoped, the clergy will not let slip any proper opportunity of improving the pious dispositions of the Queen and kingdom, for the advantage of the Church; when by the example of times past, they consider how rarely such conjunctures are like to happen. What if some method were thought on towards repairing of churches? for which there is like to be too frequent occasions, those ancient Gothic structures, throughout this kingdom, going every year to decay. That expedient of repairing or rebuilding them by charitable collections, seems in my opinion not very suitable, either to the dignity and usefulness of the work, or to the honour of our country; since it might be so easily done, with very little charge to the public, in a much more decent and honourable manner, while Parliaments are so frequently called. But these and other regulations must be left to a time of peace, which I shall humbly presume to wish may soon be our share, however offensive it may be to any, either abroad or at home, who are gainers by the war.

NUMB. 44.[1]

FROM THURSDAY MAY 24, TO THURSDAY MAY 31, 1711.

Scilicet, ut possem curvo dignoscere rectum.[2]

HAVING been forced in my papers to use the cant-words of Whig and Tory, which have so often varied their significations, for twenty years past; I think it necessary to say something of the several changes those two terms have undergone since that period; and then to tell the reader what I have always understood by each of them, since I undertook this work. I reckon that these sorts of conceited appellations, are usually invented by the vulgar; who not troubling themselves to examine through the merits of a cause, are consequently the most violent partisans of what they espouse; and in their quarrels, usually proceed to their beloved argument of *calling names*, till at length they light upon one which is sure to stick; and in time, each party grows proud of that appellation, which their adversaries at first intended for a reproach. Of this kind were the Prasini and Veneti,[3] the Guelfs and Ghibellines,[4] Huguenots and Papists, Roundheads and Cavaliers,[5] with

[1] No. 43 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] Horace, "Epistles," II. ii. 44.

"Fair truth from falsehood to discern."—P. FRANCIS. [T. S.]

[3] There were four factions, or parties, distinguished by their colours, which contended in the ancient circus at Constantinople. The white and the red were the most ancient. In the sixth century the dissension between the green (or Prasini) and the blue (or Veneti) was so violent, that 40,000 men were killed, and the factions were abolished from that time. See also Gibbon's "Rome," chap. xl. [T. S.]

[4] The Guelfs were the Papal and popular party in Italy, and the Ghibellines were the imperial and aristocratic. It is said that these names were first used as war cries at the battle of Weinsberg in 1140. [T. S.]

[5] These terms came into use about 1641. [T. S.]

many others, of ancient and modern date. Among us of late there seems to have been a barrenness of invention in this point; the words Whig and Tory,[1] though they are not much above thirty years old, having been pressed to the service of many successions of parties, with very different ideas fastened to them. This distinction, I think, began towards the latter part of King Charles the Second's reign; was dropped during that of his successor, and then revived at the Revolution; since which it has perpetually flourished, though applied to very different kinds of principles and persons. In that Convention of Lords and Commons,[2] some of both Houses were for a regency to the Prince of Orange, with a reservation of style and title to the absent king, which should be made use of in all public acts. Others,

[1] Writing under date, 1681, Burnet says: "At this time the distinguishing names of Whig and Tory came to be the denominations of the parties" ("Hist. Own Times," i. 499). [T. S.]

Whig-a-more was a nick-name given to the western peasantry of Scotland, from their using the words frequently in driving strings of horses. Hence, as connected with Calvinistical principles in religion, and republican doctrines in policy, it was given as a term of reproach to the opposition party in the latter years of Charles II. These retorted upon the courtiers the word *Tory*, signifying an Irish freebooter, and particularly applicable to the Roman Catholic followers of the Duke of York. [S.]

Macaulay's explanation of the origin of these two terms is somewhat different from that given by Scott. "In Scotland," he says, "some of the persecuted Covenanters, driven mad by oppression, had lately murdered the Primate, had taken arms against the government," etc. "These zealots were most numerous among the rustics of the western lowlands, who were vulgarly called Whigs. Thus the appellation of Whig was fastened on the Presbyterian zealots of Scotland, and was transferred to those English politicians who showed a disposition to oppose the court, and to treat Protestant Nonconformists with indulgence. The bogs of Ireland, at the same time, afforded a refuge to Popish outlaws, much resembling those who were afterwards known as Whiteboys. These men were then called Tories. The name of Tory was therefore given to Englishmen who refused to concur in excluding a Roman Catholic prince from the throne" ("History of England," vol. i., chap. ii.). [T. S.]

[2] The Convention was summoned by the Prince of Orange in December, 1688. After a lengthened debate they resolved, on February 12th, 168$\frac{8}{9}$, that the Prince and Princess of Orange should "be declared King and Queen." The Sovereigns were proclaimed on February 13th, and on the 20th the Convention was voted a Parliament. [T. S.]

when they were brought to allow the throne vacant, thought the succession should immediately go to the next heir, according to the fundamental laws of the kingdom, as if the last king were actually dead. And though the dissenting lords (in whose House the chief opposition was) did at last yield both those points, took the oaths to the new king, and many of them employments, yet they were looked upon with an evil eye by the warm zealots of the other side; neither did the court ever heartily favour any of them, though some were of the most eminent for abilities and virtue, and served that prince, both in his councils and his army, with untainted faith. It was apprehended, at the same time, and perhaps it might have been true, that many of the clergy would have been better pleased with that scheme of a regency, or at least an uninterrupted lineal succession, for the sake of those whose consciences were truly scrupulous; and they thought there were some circumstances, in the case of the deprived bishops,[1] that looked a little hard, or at least deserved commiseration.

These, and other the like reflections did, as I conceive, revive the denominations of Whig and Tory.

Some time after the Revolution the distinction of high and low-church came in, which was raised by the Dissenters, in order to break the Church party, by dividing the members into high and low; and the opinions raised, that the high joined with the Papists, inclined the low to fall in with the Dissenters.

And here I shall take leave to produce some principles, which in the several periods of the late reign, served to denote a man of one or the other party. To be against a standing army in time of peace, was all high-church, Tory and Tantivy.[2] To differ from a majority of b[isho]ps was

[1] The bishops who were deprived for refusing to take the oath of allegiance to King William were: Sancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury; Ken, Bishop of Bath; White, Bishop of Peterborough; Turner, Bishop of Ely; Frampton, Bishop of Gloucester; and Lloyd, Bishop of Norwich. [T. S.]

[2] Writing to Stella, under date October 10th, 1711, Swift complains that "The Protestant Post-Boy" says "that an ambitious tantivy, missing of his towering hopes of preferment in Ireland, is come over to vent his spleen on the late ministry," etc. (vol. ii., p. 258, of present edition). [T. S.]

the same. To raise the prerogative above law for serving a turn, was low-church and Whig. The opinion of the majority in the House of Commons, especially of the country-party or landed interest, was high-flying[1] and rank Tory. To exalt the king's supremacy beyond all precedent, was low-church, Whiggish and moderate. To make the least doubt of the pretended prince being supposititious, and a tiler's son, was, in their phrase, "top and topgallant," and perfect Jacobitism. To resume the most exorbitant grants, that were ever given to a set of profligate favourites, and apply them to the public, was the very quintessence of Toryism; notwithstanding those grants were known to be acquired, by sacrificing the honour and the wealth of England.

In most of these principles, the two parties seem to have shifted opinions, since their institution under King Charles the Second, and indeed to have gone very different from what was expected from each, even at the time of the Revolution. But as to that concerning the Pretender, the Whigs have so far renounced it, that they are grown the great advocates for his legitimacy: which gives me the opportunity of vindicating a noble d[uke] who was accused of a blunder in the House, when upon a certain lord's mentioning the pretended Prince, his g[race] told the lords, he "must be plain with them, and call that person, not the pretended prince, but the pretended impostor:" which was so far from a blunder in that polite l[or]d, as his ill-willers give out, that it was only a refined way of delivering the avowed sentiments of his whole party.

But to return, this was the state of principles when the Qu[een] came to the crown; some time after which, it pleased certain great persons, who had been all their lives in the altitude of Tory-profession, to enter into a treaty with the Whigs, from whom they could get better terms than from their old friends, who began to be resty, and would not allow monopolies of power and favour; nor consent to carry on the war entirely at the expense of this nation, that they might have pensions from abroad; while another

[1] "The most virtuous and pious enemy to their wicked principles [*i.e.*, to those of the Calves-Head Club] is always cried down as a high-flyer, a Papist, and a traitor to his country" ("Secret History of the Calves-Head Club," 7th edit., 1709). [T. S.]

people, more immediately concerned in the war, traded with the enemy as in times of peace. Whereas, the other party, whose case appeared then as desparate, was ready to yield to any conditions that would bring them into play. And I cannot help affirming, that this nation was made a sacrifice to the unmeasurable appetite of power and wealth in a very few, that shall be nameless, who in every step they made, acted directly against what they had always professed. And if his Royal Highness the Prince[1] had died some years sooner (who was a perpetual check in their career) it is dreadful to think how far they might have proceeded.

Since that time, the bulk of the Whigs appears rather to be linked to a certain set of persons, than any certain set of principles: so that if I were to define a member of that party, I would say, he was one "who believed in the late m[inist]ry." And therefore, whatever I have affirmed of Whigs in any of these papers, or objected against them, ought to be understood, either of those who were partisans of the late men in power, and privy to their designs; or such who joined with them, from a hatred to our monarchy and Church, as unbelievers and Dissenters of all sizes: or men in office, who had been guilty of much corruption, and dreaded a change; which would not only put a stop to further abuses for the future, but might, perhaps, introduce examinations of what was past. Or those who had been too highly obliged, to quit their supporters with any common decency. Or lastly, the money-traders, who could never hope to make their markets so well of *premiums* and exorbitant interest, and high remittances, under any other administration.

Under these heads, may be reduced the whole body of those whom I have all along understood for Whigs: for I do not include within this number, any of those who have been misled by ignorance, or seduced by plausible pretences, to think better of that sort of men than they deserve, and to apprehend mighty danger from their disgrace: because, I believe, the greatest part of such well-meaning people, are now thoroughly converted.

And indeed, it must be allowed, that those two fantastic

[1] Prince George of Denmark died October 28th, 1708. [T. S.]

names of Whig and Tory, have at present very little relation to those opinions, which were at first thought to distinguish them. Whoever formerly professed himself to approve the Revolution, to be against the Pretender, to justify the succession in the house of Hanover, to think the British monarchy not absolute, but limited by laws, which the executive power could not dispense with, and to allow an indulgence to scrupulous consciences; such a man was content to be called a Whig. On the other side, whoever asserted the Queen's hereditary right; that the persons of princes were sacred; their lawful authority not to be resisted on any pretence; nor even their usurpations, without the most extreme necessity: that breaches in the succession were highly dangerous; that schism was a great evil, both in itself and its consequences; that the ruin of the Church, would probably be attended with that of the State; that no power should be trusted with those who are not of the established religion; such a man was usually called a Tory. Now, though the opinions of both these are very consistent, and I really think are maintained at present by a great majority of the kingdom; yet, according as men apprehend the danger greater, either from the Pretender and his party, or from the violence and cunning of other enemies to the constitution; so their common discourses and reasonings, turn either to the first or second set of these opinions I have mentioned, and are consequently styled either Whigs or Tories. Which is, as if two brothers apprehended their house would be set upon, but disagreed about the place from whence they thought the robbers would come, and therefore would go on different sides to defend it. They must needs weaken and expose themselves by such a separation; and so did we, only our case was worse: for in order to keep off a weak, remote enemy, from whom we could not suddenly apprehend any danger, we took a nearer and a stronger one into the house. I make no comparison at all between the two enemies: Popery and slavery are without doubt the greatest and most dreadful of any; but I may venture to affirm, that the fear of these, have not, at least since the Revolution, been so close and pressing upon us, as that from another faction; excepting only one short period, when the leaders of that very faction, invited the

abdicating king to return; of which I have formerly taken notice.

Having thus declared what sort of persons I have always meant, under the denomination of Whigs, it will be easy to shew whom I understand by Tories. Such whose principles in Church and State, are what I have above related; whose actions are derived from thence, and who have no attachment to any set of ministers, further than as these are friends to the constitution in all its parts, but will do their utmost to save their prince and country, whoever be at the helm.

By these descriptions of Whig and Tory, I am sensible those names are given to several persons very undeservedly; and that many a man is called by one or the other, who has not the least title to the blame or praise I have bestowed on each of them throughout my papers.

NUMB. 45.[1]

FROM THURSDAY MAY 31, TO THURSDAY JUNE 7, 1711.[2]

Magna vis est, magnum nomen, unum et idem sentientis Senatus.[3]

WHOEVER calls to mind the clamour and the calumny, the artificial fears and jealousies, the shameful misrepresentation of persons and of things, that were raised and spread by the leaders and instruments of a certain party, upon the change of the last ministry, and dissolution of Parliament; if he be a true lover of his country, must feel a mighty pleasure, though mixed with some indignation, to see the wishes, the conjectures, the endeavours, of an inveterate faction entirely disappointed; and this important period wholly spent, in restoring the prerogative to the prince, liberty to the subject, in reforming past abuses, preventing future, supplying old deficiencies, providing for debts, restoring the clergy to their rights, and taking care of the necessities of the Church: and all this unattended with any of those misfortunes which some men hoped for, while they pretended to fear.

For my own part, I must confess, the difficulties appeared so great to me, from such a noise and shew of opposition, that I thought nothing but the absolute necessity of affairs, could ever justify so daring an attempt. But, a wise and

[1] No. 44 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] To Stella, about this time, Swift wrote giving a decided hint of the end of his term on "The Examiner." Under date June 7th, 1711, he says: "As for the 'Examiner,' I have heard a whisper, that after that of this day, which tells what this Parliament has done, you will hardly find them so good. I prophesy they will be trash for the future; and methinks in this day's 'Examiner' the author talks doubtfully, as if he would write no more" (vol. ii., pp. 192-3 of present edition). [T. S.]

[3] "Great is the power, great the name, of a Senate which is unanimous in its opinions."—H. T. RILEY. [T. S.]

good prince, at the head of an able ministry, and of a senate freely chosen; all united to pursue the true interest of their country, is a power, against which, the little inferior politics of any faction, will be able to make no long resistance. To this we may add one additional strength, which in the opinion of our adversaries, is the greatest and justest of any; I mean the *vox populi*, so indisputably declarative on the same side. I am apt to think, when these discarded politicians begin seriously to consider all this, they will think it proper to give out, and reserve their wisdom for some more convenient juncture.

It was pleasant enough to observe, that those who were the chief instruments of raising the noise, who started fears, bespoke dangers, and formed ominous prognostics, in order scare the allies, to spirit the French, and fright ignorant people at home; made use of those very opinions themselves had broached, for arguments to prove, that the change of ministers was dangerous and unseasonable. But if a house be swept, the more occasion there is for such a work, the more dust it will raise; if it be going to ruin, the repairs, however necessary, will make a noise, and disturb the neighbourhood a while. And as to the rejoicings made in France,[1] if it be true, that they had any, upon the news of those alterations among us; their joy was grounded upon the same hopes with that of the Whigs, who comforted themselves, that a change of ministry and Parliament, would infallibly put us all into confusion, increase our divisions, and destroy our credit; wherein, I suppose, by this time they are equally undeceived.

But this long session, being in a manner ended,[2] which several circumstances, and one accident, altogether unforeseen, have drawn out beyond the usual time; it may be some small piece of justice to so excellent an assembly, barely to mention a few of those great things they have done for the service of their QUEEN and country; which I shall take notice of, just as they come to my memory.

The credit of the nation began mightily to suffer by a discount upon exchequer bills, which have been generally reckoned the surest and most sacred of all securities. The

[1] See No. 24, *ante*, and note on p. 145. [T. S.]
[2] The session did not actually close till June 12th. [T. S.]

present lord treasurer, then a member of the House of Commons, proposed a method, which was immediately complied with, of raising them to a *par* with *specie*;[1] and so they have ever since continued.

The British colonies of Nevis and St. Christopher's,[2] had been miserably plundered by the French, their houses burnt, their plantations destroyed, and many of the inhabitants carried away prisoners: they had often, for some years past, applied in vain for relief from hence; till the present Parliament, considering their condition as a case of justice and mercy, voted them one hundred thousand pound by way of recompense, in some manner, for their sufferings.

Some persons, whom the voice of the nation authorizes me to call her enemies, taking advantage of the general Naturalization Act, had invited over a great number of foreigners of all religions, under the name of Palatines;[3] who understood no trade or handicraft, yet rather chose to beg than labour;[4] who besides infesting our streets, bred con-

[1] The House of Commons had resolved on January 16th, 171¾, to provide for converting all non-specie exchequer bills into specie. [T. S.]

[2] The Act for licensing and regulating hackney coaches, etc. (9 Ann. c. 16) provided that a sum of £103,003 11*s.* 4*d.* should be distributed among those proprietors and inhabitants of Nevis and St. Christopher's who had suffered "very great losses by a late invasion of the French." [T. S.]

[3] See note on p. 264. [T. S.]

[4] A petition was presented to the House of Commons on January 15th, 171¾, against the Palatines as likely to spread disease and to become chargeable to the parish. [T. S.]

The exactions of the French armies in the Palatinate, in the year 1709, drove from their habitations six or seven thousand persons of all descriptions and professions, who came into Holland with a view of emigrating to British America. It was never accurately ascertained, with what view, or by whose persuasions, their course was changed, but, by direction from the English ministers, they were furnished with shipping to come to England. In the settlements, they would have been a valuable colony; but in the vicinity of London, this huge accession to the poor of the metropolis was a burthen and a nuisance. They were encamped on Blackheath, near Greenwich, where, so soon as their countrymen heard that they were supported by British charity, the number of the fugitives began to increase by recruits from the Continent, till government prohibited further importation. A general Naturalization Act, passed in favour of the French Protestants, greatly encouraged this influx of strangers. This matter was inquired into by the Tory Parlia-

tagious diseases, by which we lost in natives, thrice the number of what we gained in foreigners. The House of Commons, as a remedy against this evil, brought in a bill for repealing that Act of general Naturalization, which, to the surprise of most people, was rejected by the L[or]ds.[1] And upon this occasion, I must allow myself to have been justly rebuked by one of my weekly monitors, for pretending in a former paper, to hope that law would be repealed; wherein the Commons being disappointed, took care however to send many of the Palatines away, and to represent their being invited over, as a pernicious counsel.[2]

The Qualification Bill,[3] incapacitating all men to serve in Parliament, who have not some estate in land, either in possession or certain reversion, is perhaps the greatest security that ever was contrived for preserving the constitution, which otherwise might, in a little time, lie wholly at the mercy of the moneyed interest: And since much the greatest part of the taxes is paid, either immediately from land, or from the productions of it, it is but common justice, that those who are the proprietors, should appoint what portion of it ought to go to the support of the public; otherwise, the engrossers of money, would be apt to lay heavy loads on others, which themselves never touch with one of their fingers.

ment, who voted, that the bringing over the Palatines was an oppression on the nation, and a waste of the public money, and that he who advised it was an enemy to his country. The unfortunate fugitives had been already dispersed; some of them to North America, some to Ireland, and some through Britain. The pretence alleged for the vote against them, was the apprehension expressed by the guardians of the poor in several parishes, that they might introduce contagious diseases; but the real reason was a wish to gratify the prejudice of the common people against foreigners, and to diminish the number of Dissenters. [S.]

[1] See No. 26, *ante*, and note on p. 160. [T. S.]

[2] On the invitation of the lord lieutenant 3,000 Palatines were sent into Ireland in August, 1709, and 800 in the following February. Many of them subsequently returned to England in the hope that they would be sent to Carolina. Large numbers had been brought to England from Holland at the Queen's expense, after the passing of the Naturalization Act. The government spent £22,275 in transporting 3,300 of them to New York and establishing them there, undertaking to maintain them until they could provide for themselves. These sums were to be repaid within four years. [T. S.]

[3] See No. 35, *ante*, and note on p. 225. [T. S.]

The public debts were so prodigiously increased, by the negligence and corruption of those who had been managers of the revenue; that the late m[iniste]rs, like careless men, who run out their fortunes, were so far from any thoughts of payment, as they had not the courage to state or compute them. The Parliament found that thirty-five millions had never been accounted for; and that the debt on the navy, wholly unprovided for, amounted to nine millions.[1] The late chancellor of the exchequer, suitable to his transcendent genius for public affairs, proposed a fund to be security for that immense debt, which is now confirmed by a law, and is likely to prove the greatest restoration and establishment of the kingdom's credit.[2] Nor content with this, the legislature hath appointed commissioners of accompts, to inspect into past mismanagements of the public money, and prevent them for the future.[3]

I have, in a former paper, mentioned the Act for building fifty new Churches in London and Westminster,[4] with a fund appropriated for that pious and noble work. But while I am mentioning acts of piety, it would be unjust to conceal my lord high treasurer's concern for religion, which have extended even to another kingdom: his lordship having some months ago, obtained of her Majesty a remission of the first-fruits and tenths to the clergy of Ireland,[5] as he is known to have formerly done for that reverend body in this kingdom.

The Act for carrying on a Trade to the South-Sea,[6] proposed by the same great person, whose thoughts are per-

[1] See No. 41, *ante*, and note on p. 264. The debt on the navy is a portion of the thirty-five millions referred to. [T. S.]

[2] Harley proposed a scheme, on May 2nd, 1711, by which all public and national debts and deficiencies were to be satisfied. Resolutions were passed on May 3rd, and a Bill brought in on the 17th, which was the origin of the celebrated South Sea scheme referred to later in the text. [T. S.]

[3] The Bill for examining the Public Accounts (9 Ann. c. 18) became law on May 16th. [T. S.]

[4] See No. 43, *ante*, pp. 278 *et seq.* [T. S.]

[5] On August 15th, 1711, Swift wrote to Archbishop King: "He [the lord treasurer] told me, 'he had lately received a letter from the bishops of Ireland, subscribed (as I remember) by seventeen, acknowledging his favour about the first-fruits'" (Scott's edition, xv. 465). [T. S.]

[6] The South Sea Company was established in pursuance of the Act 9 Ann. c. 15. [T. S.]

petually employed, and always with success, on the good of his country, will, in all probability, if duly executed, be of mighty advantage to the kingdom, and an everlasting honour to the present Parliament.[1]

I might go on further, and mention that seasonable law against excessive gaming;[2] the putting a stop to that scandalous fraud of false musters in the Guards;[3] the diligent and effectual enquiry made by the Commons into several gross abuses.[4] I might produce many instances of their impartial justice in deciding controverted election, against former example, and great provocations to retaliate.[5] I might shew their cheerful readiness in granting such vast supplies; their great unanimity, not to be broken by all the arts of a malicious and cunning faction; their unfeigned duty to the QUEEN; and lastly, that representation made to her Majesty from the House of Commons, discovering such a spirit and disposition in that noble assembly, to redress all those evils, which a long mal-administration had brought upon us.[6]

It is probable, that trusting only to my memory, I may

[1] The disastrous results of the South Sea scheme, when the company failed in 1720-21, are matter of history. [T. S.]

[2] A Bill for the better preventing of Excessive and Deceitful Gaming, was introduced January 25th, 171$\frac{0}{1}$, passed April 11th, and obtained the Royal Assent, May 16th (9 Ann. c. 19). A similar bill, which had passed the House of Commons in 17$\frac{0}{1}\frac{8}{8}$, was dropped in the House of Lords. [T. S.]

[3] A committee of the House of Commons was appointed, on February 5th, 171$\frac{0}{1}$, to inquire into alleged false musters in the Guards. A petition was presented to the House on February 13th, complaining that tradesmen were listed in Her Majesty's Guards "to screen and protect them from their creditors." A clause was inserted in the Recruiting Bill to remedy this evil (10 Ann. c. 12; see sec. 39), and the House passed a strong resolution against the practice, on May 26th, when considering the report of the committee. [T. S.]

[4] The House of Commons, on June 4th, presented a representation to the Queen on mismanagements and abuses. [T. S.]

[5] A large number of petitions to the House of Commons concerning controverted elections had been considered in December, 1710. [T. S.]

[6] Towards the close of the very long representation addressed to the Queen on June 4th, the Commons said: "We . . . beseech your Majesty . . . that you would employ in places of authority and trust such only, as have given good testimonies of their duty to your Majesty, and of their affection to the true interest of your kingdom." [T. S.]

have omitted many things of great importance; neither do I pretend further in the compass of this paper, than to give the world some general, however imperfect idea, how worthily this great assembly hath discharged the trust of those who so freely chose them; and what we may reasonably hope and expect from the piety, courage, wisdom, and loyalty of such excellent patriots, in a time so fruitful of occasions to exert the greatest abilities.

And now I conceive the main design I had in writing these papers, is fully executed. A great majority of the nation is at length thoroughly convinced, that the Qu[een] proceeded with the highest wisdom, in changing her ministry and Parliament. That under a former administration, the greatest abuses of all kinds were committed, and the most dangerous attempts against the constitution for some time intended. The whole kingdom finds the present persons in power, directly and openly pursuing the true service of their QUEEN and country; and to be such whom their most bitter enemies cannot tax with bribery, covetousness, ambition, pride, insolence, or any pernicious principles in religion or government.

For my own particular, those little barking pens which have so constantly pursued me, I take to be of no further consequence to what I have writ, than the scoffing slaves of old, placed behind the chariot, to put the general in mind of his mortality;[1] which was but a thing of form, and made no stop or disturbance in the shew. However, if those perpetual snarlers against me, had the same design, I must own they have effectually compassed it; since nothing can well be more mortifying, than to reflect that I am of the same species with creatures capable of uttering so much scurrility, dullness, falsehood and impertinence, to the scandal and disgrace of human nature.

[1] In a Roman triumph a slave accompanied the victorious general to whisper in his ear: "Remember that thou art but a man." [T. S.]

NUMB. 46.[1]

FROM THURSDAY JUNE 7, TO THURSDAY JUNE 14, 1711.[2]

Melius non tangere clamo.[3]

WHEN a general has conquered an army, and reduced a country to obedience, he often finds it necessary to send out small bodies, in order to take in petty castles and forts, and beat little straggling parties, which are otherwise, apt to make head and infest the neighbourhood: This case exactly resembles mine; I count the main body of the Whigs entirely subdued; at least, till they appear with new reinforcements, I shall reckon them as such; and therefore do now find myself at leisure to *Examine* inferior abuses. The business I have left, is, to fall on those wretches that will be still keeping the war on foot, when they have no country to defend, no forces to bring into the field, nor any thing remaining, but their bare good-will towards faction and mischief: I mean, the present set of writers, whom I have suffered, without molestation, so long to infest the town. Were there not a concurrence from prejudice, party, weak understanding, and misrepresentation, I should think them too inconsiderable in themselves to deserve correction: But as my endeavour hath been to expose the gross

[1] No. 45 in the reprint. [T. S.]

[2] In his "Journal to Stella," under date June 22nd, 1711, Swift writes: "Yesterday's was a sad 'Examiner,' and last week was very indifferent, though some little scraps of the old spirit, as if he had given some hints; but yesterday's is all trash. It is plain the hand is changed" (vol. ii., p. 195).

On November 2nd he gives the following account: "I have sent to Leigh the set of 'Examiners'; the first thirteen were written by several hands, some good, some bad; the next three-and-thirty were all by one hand, that makes forty-six: then that author, whoever he was, laid it down on purpose to confound guessers; and the last six were written by a woman" (vol. ii., p. 273). [T. S.]

[3] Horace, "Satires," II. i. 45.

"'Better not touch me, friend,' I loud exclaim."—P. FRANCIS. [T. S.]

impositions of the fallen party, I will give a taste, in the following petition, of the sincerity of these their factors, to shew how little those writers for the Whigs were guided by conscience or honour, their business being only to gratify a prevailing interest.

> "*To the Right Honourable the present M[inist]ry, the humble Petition of the Party Writers to the late M[inist]ry.*
>
> "HUMBLY SHEWETH,
>
> "*That your petitioners have served their time to the trade of writing pamphlets and weekly papers, in defence of the Whigs, against the Church of England, and the Christian religion, and her Majesty's prerogative, and her title to the crown: That since the late change of ministry, and meeting of this Parliament, the said trade is mightily fallen off, and the call for the said pamphlets and papers, much less than formerly; and it is feared, to our further prejudice, that the 'Examiner' may discontinue writing, whereby some of your petitioners will be brought to utter distress, forasmuch as through false quotations, noted absurdities, and other legal abuses, many of your petitioners, to their great comfort and support, were enabled to pick up a weekly subsistence out of the said 'Examiner.'*
>
> "*That your said poor petitioners, did humbly offer your Honours to write in defence of the late change of ministry and Parliament, much cheaper than they did for your predecessors, which your Honours were pleased to refuse.*
>
> "*Notwithstanding which offer, your petitioners are under daily apprehension, that your Honours will forbid them to follow the said trade any longer; by which your petitioners, to the number of fourscore, with their wives and families, will inevitably starve, having been bound to no other calling.*
>
> "Your petitioners desire your Honours will tenderly consider the premisses, and suffer your said petitioners to continue their trade (those who set them at work, being still willing to employ them, though at lower rates) and your said petitioners will give security to make use of the same stuff, and dress it in the same manner, as they always did, and no other. *And your petitioners*," *&c.*